U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

BILLFISH AND HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES ADVISORY

PANELS

+ + + + +

JOINT MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2005

+ + + + +

The meeting came to order at 1:00 p.m. at the Holiday Inn, Silver Spring, Maryland.

ADVISORY PANEL ROSTER:

NELSON BEIDEMAN Blue Water Fisherman's

Association

WILLIAM GERENCER Marine Trade Center

DEWEY HEMILRIGHT F/V Tar Baby

RUSSELL HUDSON Directed Shark Fisheries,

Inc.

GAIL JOHNSON Pocahontas, Inc.

DON NEHLS Lindgren-Pittman, Inc.

PETE MANUEL

RICHARD RUAIS East Coast Tuna Association

PETER WEISS General Category Tuna

Association

JAMES DONOFRIO Recreational Fishing Alliance

MICHAEL LEECH International Game Fishing

Association

JOE McBRIDE Montauk Boatmen & Captains

Association

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

RUSSELL NELSON	2 Nelson Resources Consulting
MARK SAMPSON	Ocean City Charter Boat Captain's Association
RICHARD B. STONE	
WILLIAM UTLEY	Coastal Conservation Association
ROM WHITAKER	Hatteras Harbor Charter Boats
SHANA MILLER	
RAMON BONFIL	Wildlife Conservation Society
SONJA FORDHAM	The Ocean Conservancy
MERRY CAMHI. Ph.D.	Independent Consultant
DR. PHIL GOODYEAR	
DR. ROBERT HUETER	Center for Shark Research
DR. JOHNS GRAVES	Virginia Institute of Marine

Science

JULIE MORRIS Gulf of Mexico Fishery

Management Council

BOBBI WALKER Gulf of Mexico Fishery

Management Council

FRANK BLOUNT New England Fishery

Management Council

DR. LOUIS DANIEL South Atlantic Fishery

Management Council

RICKS E. SAVAGE Mid Atlantic Fishery

Management Council

ROBERT PRIDE eBusiness Solutions, Inc.

EUGENIO PINELRO-SOLER Caribbean Fishery Management

Council

LARRY SIMPSON Gulf States Marine Fisheries

Commission

JOHN V. O'SHEA Atlantic State Marine

Fisheries Commission

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

RANDY BLANKENSHIP Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department

PRESTON P. PATE NC Division of Marine

Fisheries

DAVID M. CUPKA SC Department of Natural

Resources

GLENN ULRICH SC Department of Natural

Resources

HENRY ANSLEY Georgia Coastal Resources

Division

HOWARD KING Maryland Department of

Natural Resources

JACK DEVNEW Blue Water Fisherman's

Association

WILLIAM ETHERIDGE NC Fisheries Association

PAMELA BASCO GFMC Advisory Panel

ROBERT F. ZALES, II

DR. JOHN M. DEAN South Atlantic Management

Council

KIM AMENDOLA Florida Fish and Wildlife

Conservation Commission

<u>CONTENTS</u>	4	
Introduction	5Deleted: 01:00 p.m.)
Summary Information		
2005 Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) Report	22 • Formatted: Bullets and Numbering)
Management actions completed in 2004	24	
Annual meeting of International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas(ICCAT)	27 • Formatted: Bullets and Numbering)
Consolidation of HMS and Billfish FMPs	42 • Formatted: Bullets and Numbering)
Expected management actions in 2005		
Proposed rule for Shark 2nd/3rd Trimester Seasons (Public hearing and public comment)	59 • Formatted: Bullets and Numbering)
Proposed rule for ICCAT Trade Lifting	84 • Formatted: Bullets and Numbering)
2005 Bluefin Tuna Quota Specifications	90	
Informal Discussion	108	
Adjourn	156	

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

GREETINGS AND INTRODUCTIONS

everybody, to Silver Spring. Once again for those on the ICCAT Advisory Committee meeting, it hasn't been that long. I thought -- we'll just introduce a few new panel members, but then for the benefit of everybody we'll go around the table for introductions. Othel (phonetic) has set up a sign_in_ sheet, and that is important for us, so I do appreciate if you can actually sign in. Some of the situations that have manifested themselves in the past so that individuals can, depending on circumstances, wear one hat or another, whether they're representing a state or a council.

So especially for those ex-officio offices, the State's Council Commissions, it's good for us to have that signed in so we can ascertain who exactly is at the meeting and the hat that they are wearing. With respect to the appointed members, I just wanted to point out a few new folks, Dewey Hemilright, where are you at? There he is, welcome Dewey, and Jaime Alvarado. I guess the new folks are actually finding the corner there to their liking. And Dick Stone, so Dick Stone is a fixture around here.

As far as proxies, I did understand that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Deleted: g

Deleted:

Glenn Delaney would be here representing Don Nehls -Glenn, I see Glenn here, and Robert Fitzpatrick would
be representing Peter Weiss. And I wasn't sure
whether we heard back from Mark Sampson, Mark Sampson
here? He did indicate he had some trouble attending
and wasn't sure whether he had found a proxy or not,
and Merry Camhi was unable to attend, she was working
on a proxy, but hadn't got any confirmation, no, and
then Peter Manuel.

Pete, why don't you come over here and sit with the new guys over there? I'm just kidding you, I'm just kidding you -- you are in good company there between Richard Ruais, and Bob McAuliffe.

But real quickly let's maybe just go around the table, starting over here with Ramon, so everybody can identify themselves. And if you are an ex-officio council or state, just indicate who you're representing, if you are an appointed member, whether you are representing commercial, recreational, environmental, or academic interests. Thank you.

MR. BONFIL: Ramon Bonfil, Wildlife Conservation Society, environmental.

MR. DELANEY: Glenn Delaney, I'm sitting in for Don Nehls, Commercial Sector.

MR. BEIDEMAN: Nelson Beideman, Blue Water

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Fisherman's Association.
2	MS. JOHNSON: Gail Johnson, Commercial
3	Fishing Vessels Seneca.
4	MR. HINMAN: Ken Hinman, National Coalition
5	for Marine Conservation, environmental.
6	MR. McAULIFFE: Bob McAuliffe, St. Croix,
7	commercial.
8	MR. MANUEL: Pete Manuel, Winter Bluefin
9	Association, commercial.
10	MR. RUAIS: Richard Ruais, with East Coast
11	Tuna Association, commercial.
12	MR. ULRICH: Glenn Ulrich, South Carolina,
13	State Representative.
14	MR. ANSLEY: Henry Ansley, Georgia State
15	Representative.
16	MR. GERENCER: William Gerencer, HMS,
17	commercial, Bowdoin, Maine.
18	MR. WHITAKER: Rom Whitaker, Hatteras
19	Charter Boat, recreational.
20	MR. DANIEL: Louis Daniel, today I'll be
21	representing North Carolina.
22	MS. MERRITT: Rita Merritt, South Atlantic
23	Council, I'm filling in for John Dean.
24	MR. DITTON: Texas A&M University,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

academic.

1	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I apologize,
2	Bob, I missed you. Bob is one of our new appointees
3	as well; should have sat amongst the other new
4	members, I would've noticed you. Sorry about that.
5	MR. GOODYEAR: Phil Goodyear, Independent,
6	academic.
7	MS. PEEL: Ellen Peel, The Billfish
8	Foundation, recreational.
9	MR. NELSON: Russell Nelson, recreational.
L O	MS. WALKER: Bobbi Walker, Gulf of Mexico
L1	Fishery Management Council.
L2	MR. ZALES: Bob Zales, II, Recreational,
L3	for hire.
L4	MR. HUETER: Bob Hueter, Mote Marine
L5	Laboratory, academic.
L6	MS. FORDHAM: Sonja Fordham, The Ocean
L7	Conservancy, I'm an environmentalist.
L8	MR. BLOUNT: Frank Blount, New England
L9	Council.
20	MR. McBRIDE: Joe McBride, New York State,
21	Montauk Boatmen and Captains Association.
22	MR. UTLEY: Bill Utley.
23	MR. LEECH: Michael Leech, IGFA,
24	recreational, I'm on the HMS committee.
25	MS. BASCO: Pam Basco, recreational.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. BLANKENSHIP: Randy Blankenship, Great
2	State of Texas.
3	MR. WEBER: Rick Weber, South Jersey
4	Marina, recreational.
5	MR. FITZPATRICK: Robert Fitzpatrick,
6	Maguro America, representing Peter Weiss, commercial.
7	MR. GRAVES: John Graves, Virginia
8	Institute of Marine Science, representing the ICCAT
9	Advisory Committee.
10	MR. STONE: Dick Stone, National Marine
11	Manufacturers Association, recreational.
12	MR. HEMILRIGHT: Dewey Hemilright,
13	Commercial Fishing.
14	MR. ALVARADO-BREMER: Jaime Alvarado-
15	Bremer, Billfish AP.
16	MS. LENT: Rebecca Lent, deputy for
17	Regulatory Programs.
18	MR. DUNNIGAN: Jack Dunnigan, NOAA.
19	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right.
20	Thank you, as far as HMS, we have pretty much the
21	entire staff here to support you throughout the
22	meeting. We do have a few new faces that you might be
23	interested in I'm sure you're interested in the old
24	ones as well, but Megan Gamble has joined us from the

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Atlantic State -- Jack is -- he always brings some of

the franchise players with him, as he had done previously, and Jackie Wilson over here is our Sea Grant Fellow for the year.

And next to her we have George Silva, who is a recent acquisition in our Economics Department and Mike Clark is probably a familiar face, because he was a Sea Grant Fellow with us last year. But now he's a full-time equivalent, as we say in the Federal Service. Probably a little bit more then a full-time equivalent, he's got a lot of energy.

The rest of the HMS staff here, we have Heather, Russ, Mark, and Dianne, Carol, Chris Willing, Juran, Ophel in the back. You all know Ophel, and make sure you sign in, and work out all your vouchers with Ophel, travel vouchers. Joe, Rick Pearson in the back, Brad McHale, and Ron Ronaldo (phonetic) and a couple of other NMFS offices represented. Anybody else from NMFS want to stand up and identify yourselves, like? No, nobody wants to. Okay.

Those in the enforcement arena often want to observe without being noticed, right? Okay.

Rebecca, deliver a few words to get us started here.

MS. LENT: Okay, thank you very much, Chris, and good afternoon everybody, it's nice to see everybody again. Some people have totally new looks,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: er

Deleted: (phonetic)

I frankly would not have recognized you, I hope you recognize me with my new look. Good to see new faces on the advisory panel, great to see Dick Stone, the man who gave me my first job in NMFS. Thank you, Dick, now we're punishing you for that by putting you on this panel. Nice to see an economist join, Dr. Ditton, good to have you with us. And I wanted to thank all of you on behalf of Bill Hogarth for all that you do. We know that you come here at your own time and it takes you away from your day jobs, and all of you have very busy day jobs, and we do appreciate that.

Bill wanted me to come here today also to let you know of some decisions that he's taken regarding the future of all the efforts that interest us here in this room in terms of highly migratory species in the Atlantic. And looking over the next four years that Dr. Hogarth is facing, he notes an increased workload and a lot of increased emphasis on ICCAT issues of the international aspects of the Atlantic highly migratory species. He is looking at that increased emphasis not only because there are a lot of issues coming down the pike and there's just an incredible workload in terms of species with new stock assessments and looking at finally resolving

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted:

some of the International Management issues, but also because Dr. Hogarth is trying to be chair of ICCAT, which would be a great thing, it would be good for the U.S. to chair, and I think Bill has learned to speak and enunciate more slowly so that the translators can actually translate his English.

So given that increased emphasis Bill needs a strong team internationally, and he has asked Chris Rogers to take a more focused role at ICCAT. As you know, Chris has been going to ICCAT regularly, and is just a superstar as I understand, I haven't witnessed, but I've heard the tales, in terms of compliance by other countries, both member and non-member countries. And this is a critical part of getting the management programs to work.

In fact there was a big issue last week at the Food and Agricultural Organization, FAO meetings, they said, "Well, these are FMOs, these regional fishery management organizations are all set up, but are they really performing?" And this is where the rubber meets the road.

So in that new role, Chris will be moving to our new -- if you haven't heard yet, we have a new office of International Fisheries, that's headed up by Jean-Pierre Ple, we stole him from the State

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: t

Department, fair and square. And Chris will be working on those issues as well as some of the other issues related to International Management and making sure that International Management -- Science and Management gets the resources that it needs through our programming and budgeting process.

Well, as you know that leaves the HMS domestic leadership plate open, and luckily, Margo Schulze-Haugen -- I'm sure you all remember Margo from a couple of years ago. She's since had some other work experiences, but she is willing to step in and serve as the acting division chief. And knowing from personal experience, as Dick Stone knows, as I know, as Bill Hogarth knows, as Chris knows, it's a very tough job, so we do appreciate Margo stepping forward. We appreciate all of you supporting her and working with Margo and the team to make sure that we meet our domestic goals while strengthening the international program.

So thank you for that and I might ask Margo just to say a few words to get back in the fray. Margo?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Well, hello. I'm excited to be back. It is a huge opportunity and a huge challenge for me, I've been away from HMS a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

little while, doing more strategic planning and budgeting for Fisheries Management. So I've been aware of HMS activities and issues, although not as directly involved as obviously I will be now.

So I'm going to be taking this time, at this meeting, to reacquaint myself with all of you that I know, meet some of the folks that I don't, and mostly listening and learning as we go into Amendment 2 and trying to come to terms and get my head around all of the issues and things to be resolved. So please feel free to contact me, seek me out, I'd like to talk to each and every_one of you. And I'll be, like I said, taking over from Chris and trying to fill some mighty big shoes in the next couple of weeks. So thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Any words from you or --

SPEAKER: No.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you Margo, I'll be seeing you, bye. Now, Margo did want to get briefed, and I said, "Well, here is a great opportunity to get briefed on all the current issues. So spend three days with us and you'll be up to speed." I was remiss, I guess that we have some panel members who were not at the table. I see Rusty Hudson

Deleted:

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and Willy Etheridge in the back.

Is there anybody else who I didn't recognize, a panel member? Okay. Well -- we're sorry we don't have space on the table. We'll see if we can correct that. I don't know that we can do that during the break today, but certainly by tomorrow morning.

Okay. Well, again welcome, the objective of this meeting is a little bit different from some of the past insofar as we have a lot of activities, actions that are in the pipeline, the most important being a amendment to the plan, both plans in fact; the billfish plan and the HMS plan, and that is one of the items that we will discuss shortly, the consolidation of the two plans.

But the objective of the meeting -obviously we've released this pre-draft a couple of
weeks ago, you've all received a copy of it I hope.
We mail those out to the panel members and what we
want is to have a frank discussion with the panel with
respect to your views on the options, alternatives,
presented in the pre-draft, so that we can narrow in
on what we call, in the National Environmental Policy
Act parlance, the preferred alternatives.

We will take those preferred alternatives out to the public in a formal draft in a proposed

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: '11

rule, and then have another opportunity for comment. We do plan on having another convening of the panel at that point to review public comment before we go finalize. So it -- it's on a pretty auspicious timeline to try to complete before this year is out. A lot of issues have been pressing for a number of years and it was time to get on with this major undertaking.

So again, our hope is that we can have a good discussion, open discussion, of the issues and seek to narrow in on the preferred alternatives for the formal draft document that will come out later this spring.

To that end we will follow our normal procedures of going around the table and making sure that we get the input from all parties, all the sectors represented, but because of the number of issues we're going to have to be very cognizant of time at this meeting and try to get on with the conversation as quickly as possible. So I know John Graves is well experienced in this avenue of moving the discussions along in his role as the ICCAT Committee Chair.

So if I'm not as tough as he is, I'll ask for his advice during the breaks, but we really will

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

need to move along, given the amount of material that we have to cover. So with that, just to call everybody's attention to the agenda, we're going to give you some summary information to get started. Then we'll have a break and we will deal with several management actions that are on the table currently very quickly this afternoon.

If we can get through those and their entirety maybe we can have some time at the end for a more open discussion. But again these are actions that are on the table currently, independent of this process with the plan amendment. The Federal Register Notices have been filed, we are in active comment periods, and I just wanted to go through those with the panel.

Tomorrow we'll begin the formal discussion of the draft document, starting off with bycatch reduction workshops, bycatch reduction continued in the areas of time/area closures, evaluating what we currently have in place, and seeing how effective they've been and what changes might be necessary. Then getting into essential fish habitat, we'll have a brief public comment period for any members of the public who are here.

If we don't have a lot of demand for public

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: team

representation we'll move on with the panel members, and getting into rebuilding and preventing overfishing for northern albacore. After a little lunch break -- rebuilding for finetooth sharks and billfish, rebuilding and preventing overfishing for billfish continuing after the break. We figure the billfish will take some time to deal with, given all the issues with the Billfish Fishery, the status review for white marlin, and the international efforts at ICCAT.

We're going to have a special session tomorrow evening, Bluefin Tuna Recreational Management and Monitoring, for those -- certainly those on the ICCAT Advisory Committee, this has been an ongoing subject, certainly also this panel. But there was a review of prior year landings for 2002-2003 that has caused a lot of concern on how we updated the regulations and management for bluefin tuna. And it's clear that we really need to make some changes there to improve the situation.

So that session will go from about 5:15 to 6:45 tomorrow evening. Hopefully nobody will miss dinner over it, should be plenty of places in Silver Spring that are still open at 6:45 in the evening. Continue the discussion of the pre-draft beginning

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Wednesday morning, management program structure, bluefin tuna quota management; this is primarily a situation of managing several different categories of bluefin tuna fishing.

Again, the evening before we're going to focus on the angling category, but these will be broader-based issues on bluefin tuna quota management, between categories and to some extent within categories, how we might handle transfers and infully season actions to allocate fishing opportunities. Have a discussion of fishing years at 9:45, just going over the transition -- at least the views expressed internally within the agency that we have not in a sense borne fruit, so to speak, for that change from a calendar year to a fishing year management cycle. And a lot of concerns whether the operation would be more efficient in going back to a calendar year.

After lunch we'll get into authorized gears, some questions on authorized gears in the -- particular in the tuna fisheries, spearguns and greenstick in particular. A discussion for some of those who are really into regulatory tax, this one is going to be fascinating. For those who don't really care for it, it might be a little bit tough to get

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: ies

Deleted: es

Deleted: c

through, but a lot of what we call housekeeping, just matters of clarifying the regulations, correcting cross-references -- but some of them do have some substantive effect like divining pelagic longline gear has an impact on whether or not VMS is required and things like that. Or with respect to whether a vessel can fish in a closed area.

So sometimes a definitional change has some substantive impacts that need to be addressed. In the afternoon, on Wednesday, we have received a petition from the State of North Carolina for rulemaking with respect to managing sharks, particularly surrounding the closed area off of North Carolina that was implemented in Amendment 1 to the FMP.

At 3:00 p.m. we had some enforcement issues that we wanted to raise, looking for some clarification on ways to address them. Another public comment period and then a wrap-up, summarizing the major discussions to the extent that we have identified preferred alternatives. We can review those to the extent that we have identified new options. We'll make sure that you're convinced that we heard you and we got them written down. And then we'll talk about the next AP meeting after the formal

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

public comment period when the draft and proposal will go out this summer.

And we'll adjourn promptly at 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday. I'm sure some of you folks have flights already booked and we don't want you to miss those, but again, we do anticipate there'll be a full agenda on Wednesday afternoon. Any comments or concerns about the agenda? Nelson?

MR. NELSON: Actually, it's, Russell, Chris.
The -- you know, the agenda is very well laid out here, and the discussion points clearly specified for Tuesday, but there is really no place that I -- and I could be wrong, maybe you can point out to me where I missed it, but there doesn't seem to be any place in here for a discussion of the consolidation idea itself. And particularly, I think that we need to have some discussion on some of the proposed revisions to the objectives, which you've had in place in the plan.

So if that is not here, I would certainly like to see us add that specifically early on tomorrow, a discussion of the consolidation and a discussion of the change in objectives.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: We actually have that right up-front, under summary information

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: this is

Deleted:

Deleted:

at 1:30, so we'll be getting into that area right next.

MR. NELSON: Okay. Well, I was confused then, Chris, because the summary information sounds to me like what you're going to tell us, as opposed to a discussion.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes.

MR. NELSON: But let's see how it goes, but I'm not certain that we're going to have ample time to deal with it.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes, we'll see how that discussion goes then. If necessary, we can see where it might fit in later, but again, we didn't envision that it would warrant as much development as some of the other substantive issues.

Any other comments or concerns on the agenda?

All right, we'll consider the agenda adopted, and move on into our summary information section. The 2005 Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation Report, or SAFE report, what we elected to do in this case was to make it part and parcel of the pre-draft, so it's basically Chapter 3 in this document, it will serve as our SAFE report for 2005.

The reason we did that was not only to save time and a lot of paper, but also your time as reviewers,

Deleted: in order

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

since it was going to form the basis -- the background information for the plan amendment. It just seemed appropriate to have that part and parcel of the same document.

So it's there, I don't know that everybody has had a chance to review it thoroughly, but to the extent that you can comment on any information you feel needs to be corrected, any deficiencies that you want to recommend that we address, either in this process or in future SAFE reports, please let us know. And we'll take comment on that in the regular comment on the pre-draft through March 31st, and certainly to the extent that comments on the SAFE report would carry forward to future years.

Certainly the panel members who have a substantive input beyond that March 31st with respect to the SAFE report, please don't hesitate to call us and talk to us about it just because you passed the comment period on the pre-draft. Management actions for -- Bob Zales?

MR. ZALES: <u>I kind of like what Russell was</u> talking about on the consolidation, "Are we not going to discuss any of this, you're just going to tell us all this?" And my question would be, because of a piece of paper that I saw back there that I have,

Deleted: Un

Deleted: , not only

Deleted: ,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

regarding the charter/headboat rates and HMS, which is in the SAFE report, are we going to discuss that here or you just want us to send comments there? Because I've got some comments.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: For something like that, yes, we'd probably -- better to take those comments offline. This is our first attempt to provide that baseline information, if you have some comments on it -- George Silva in particular, George could you raise your hand again? If you give those to George, if there is an omission or a correction, we'll try to get it into the formal If it's just a matter of talking about draft. methods or procedures to summarize that kind of information, I'm sure George would be interested in that as well.

MR. ZALES: Okay, so just get with him and discuss it with him.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes.

MR. ZALES: All right.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, management actions completed in 2004, for those who've followed one of our major initiatives in 2004, this was a rule to reduce bycatch of turtles in the pelagic longline fishery that was precipitated by a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: er

re-initiation of consultation on the fishery and that was attributed to exceeding the incidental take statement that had been previously authorized. That final rule did require the use of 18-knot or 16-knot circle hooks with or without an offset and with or without certain bait combinations.

It's quite a big impact we expect to see on the -- not only the take of turtles but certainly the post-release mortality insofar as reducing that. So again, that was a major undertaking; the final rule filed last July, and we've had several workshops with the industry during the course of the fall. And certainly, more workshops are envisioned as part of this process and we'll be discussing that later on in the meeting.

But again, we're quite hopeful that the use of these larger circle hooks and bait combinations will have an effective impact on reducing turtle takes and post-release mortality for turtles in the pelagic longline fishery. We did publish a final rule for sharks, adjusting quotas. Again, in Amendment 1 we had changed from a semiannual to a trimester approach to shark season management. And there were some issues regarding carry forward of prior-year underharvest and overharvest and setting

Deleted: arters

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

season dates. That isn't completely finished because we do have a proposed rule on the street currently to refine this issue a little bit further and we'll be discussing that shortly.

We did the VMS implementation for the bottom longline fishery, chiefly to the fishermen. We had previously implemented VMS for the pelagic longline fleet. And ICCAT trade restriction rule for certain countries, some lifting, imposing, an ICCAT statistical document rule was completed that implements the swordfish and bigeye tuna statistical documents as well as made some modifications to bluefin program.

The major change there was a new style of permit will be required for importers and exporters of swordfish, bigeye, and bluefin that we will call the HMS International Trade Permit and that becomes effective on July 1 this year. And we have some information to report after the trade shortly insofar as a compliance guide on how to get that permit and where to send your reports. The swordfish quota rule was just establishing some of the new quotas for the ICCAT rebuilding plan, and again dealing with overharvest underharvest; orin this case underharvest from prior years.

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: and

Deleted: arter

Deleted: arter

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Deleted: rter

Wе propose bluefin tuna qu<u>ot</u>a_ specifications for the 2004 fishing year. Unfortunately it was not a completed action in 2004. For those who were following the issue closely it was dependent on a final report from an internal committee that Bill Hogarth had commissioned to deal with revising the estimates of 2002 and 2003 in the angling category. And consequently, we couldn't complete that rulemaking until that report was out.

That was discussed at great length at the ICCAT Advisory Committee meeting. I still have some work to do to follow up on that. So we did finally issue the final initial specs a couple of weeks back. And pretty much fishing has ended for the season, but we do have the '05 specs out, a much quicker turnaround on the '05 specs, and we'll be talking about that later on this afternoon.

And then the scoping for the consolidated HMS FMP was undertaken last summer. We met with all the councils and had several scoping meetings up and down the coast, and this is the next step in that process. So that's what we had in terms of management actions completed in 2004 and obviously a number on the plate for 2005. Any questions on that?

No one wants to say congratulations for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: nd yes, a

getting the '05 specs out much sooner than the '04 bluefin specs? All right, thank you, thank you. Margo promises they'll never be late again, right? John Graves is going to give us a brief update of the International Commission meeting that was held in New Orleans, first time ever hosted by the United States. Thank you, John.

MR. GRAVES: Thank you, Chris.

(<u>Tape Interruption</u>)

MR. GRAVES: -- parts that really expand, so that ICCAT take a greater control over bycatch species as well as the target species. With bigeye tuna, the ICCAT had been having a series of one-year management measures for bigeye tuna. We wanted to get something that was longer term in place.

For bluefin tuna we wanted to extend the current management measures that were in place through 2005, which is when we wanted the assessments to occur in 2005 and it was -- that was made coincident with the scheduled assessment for the eastern management unit. And also to delay any kinds of allocation discussions until that time.

And with swordfish, with the assessment schedule for 2006, management measures were scheduled to expire in 2005, just to extend those. And again,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: t

Deleted: return

Deleted: at

postpone allocation discussions until 2006. So those were sort of our major objectives that we went into the meeting with.

The meeting dynamic -- this was the first time that the United States has hosted an ICCAT meeting; we did it in New Orleans. And that went really well and we had_our Sunday evening reception and we had a -- instead of sort of the big dinners that they usually have, we had a Mardi Gras parade, down the Canal Street, and then a dinner at Jasper's. And that was I think a highlight for many of the participants.

But in terms of the meeting itself, even though the chairman of the commission had tried to push to have all management measures, proposed management measures for species introduced by the first day of the meeting, he eventually backed off and said Wednesday.

Well, it turns out the bigeye management measure was submitted on Wednesday but the EC told the secretary to hold and not to distribute it. So we didn't see the bigeye management measure until the second to last day of the meeting. So even though we tried to have it arranged so that we wouldn't be dealing with things at the last minute, that's the way

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 Deleted: got

Deleted: a

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the EC likes to play the game and the chairman, Mr. Neil O'Hara (phonetic) was completely ineffectual or at least compl<u>ici</u>t with letting that happen.

Deleted: acen

So I'll just go through the four species panels and show you the major measures with bigeye tuna. We did on the last day get a measure, but in 2004 they were assessed and the current biomass of bigeye tuna is right about that, what you'd want from maximum sustained yield. However, when they were doing the assessment there were some problems with reporting of catches form the Atlantic, and it turns

out that Taiwan had a small glitch of misreporting.

Deleted:

Somewhere between 4000 and 23,000 metric tons of bigeye tuna has been from the Indian Ocean where there is no quota in the IOTC, as opposed to the So that's a big problem, both Taiwan and China have been overharvesting their catch limits for then several years. And the bigeye tuna recommendation, when it finally came out, the EC in -we have trilateral meetings with -- quadrilateral meetings with the EC, so -- before we go into the ICCAT meeting, so that they have, you know, that we know, Canada knows, Japan knows, and we also include Mexico now and we've got to have an idea where everybody wants to go.

Deleted: arter

Deleted: in one week,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the EC said we'll take care of bigeye, so we didn't really have a spare management measure in our pocket, and so that hurt us a little bit in our negotiations. But the recommendation that came out has some good things and it's got some bad things. First of all it included the capacity limitation for Taiwan, China-Taiwan, and the Philippines, the payback schedule for the overharvests of China-Taiwan.

So they agreed that yes, they'd overharvested and they also said yes, we'll pay that back. They have a schedule -- a realistic schedule to do that. There are catch limits for the major harvesters, so the major players in bigeye tuna -- of course we're a very minor player, have catch limits, but there are not -- there are no catch limits for minor harvesters.

And this is the way it's been the last couple of years, and so it turns out that, for instance, Brazil, as long as they're catching less than 2100 metric tons in the year of record; they can -- they don't have a catch limit. So they can go ahead and expand their catch limits, as can any of the minor harvesting nations. So without a catch limit on that, it's giving them the opportunity to say we want to become a player or be considered the next time. So

Deleted: 1 is also

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

that's something we have to watch out for.

The minimum size for bigeye tuna was removed. The minimum size recommendation management measure has been completely ineffectual, because in the purse seine fishery, the minimum size doesn't do you much good. When the fish are pursed in the hold, they are dead. So you've got a problem there. So that was removed. There was a change in the Gulf of Guinea time/area closure. Now, previously there had been a closure in the Gulf of Guinea for three months, which protected -- essentially, it just reduced fishing on FADs for this area for three months and that reduced the catches of tuna -- the bigeye tuna and the yellowfin tuna which all school with the skipjack tuna, which is the major fishery in that area.

But what happened was that the EC proposed this measure without any supporting science whatsoever, which is -- that's a very bad precedent to start with. Usually you would want ICCAT's fisheries science body; their standing committee on research and statistics to approve any measure before it went to the commission as a whole, but in this case that didn't happen. So instead of three months it's now a one-month closure, it's a smaller area than before.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted:

Deleted: s

Deleted: a

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And instead of just a closure on fishing on FADs, it's a one-month closure on the surface fishery, so that would be purse seine.

However, what's not clear in there is whether they have to pull the FADs out of the water. So if the FADs are still soaking in that area over that time, they are still aggregating fish. If they drift out and maybe fish, if a boat chooses to slowly tow a FAD out of the area and fish on, can they do that? Or do they just sit in that area aggregating fish and on the day -- at the end of the 30-day closure, they go and -- and it's an open season, and you really haven't produced your fishing mortality on the juveniles at all.

So -- but on the good hand, the SCRS is going to be reviewing this this year and there is in fact an SCRS intercessional workshop to look at that and for them to make recommendations for the meeting in November. (inaudible) tunas, northern Albacore, the assessment was moved from 2006 to 2007. You're going to see we have already piled up a lot of assessments in 2006.

And with this also then you have northern and southern albacore stocks being assessed during the same year. And the current -- but it's important to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

note that the current management measures for northern albacore expire in 2005, so this year we are going to have to go ahead and make sure that those are extended through 2006.

Bluefin tuna, well, we wanted to postpone the assessment until 2005, the EC said they are having so much problem with their data that we couldn't possibly have an assessment in 2005, it's got to go to So we said okay, we -- you know, our big point is that we should be assessing these together at the same time, so both are postponed until 2006. And then we'll also postpone allocation discussions until that The third meeting for the working group to time. develop integrated management strategies is going to be held in April in Japan. This was a big push by the United States to look at alternative management strategies for bluefin tuna and not just using this archaic one-stock, two-stock type of models, but looking at the dynamics of the fishery.

And so that will happen April 20 -- in fact,

April 20th in Japan, the resolution -- in an ICCAT

parlance, a resolution is non-binding, a

recommendation is binding. So this is just a

voluntary measure to cap pelagic longline effort in

the central North Atlantic and to extend it through

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: ane

2005, but again since we are going to 2006, with the other measures, this will have to be extended through much of next year.

Deleted: onto the

Within the Med, the EC wanted a measure to help reduce the sale of recreational fish and also to define recreational gear, so longlines, purse seine, and circling nets are no longer considered to be recreational. Minimum size in the Mediterranean was increased from 6.4 to 10 kilos. That's only within the Med, outside of the Med it's 6.4 kilos, in the eastern Atlantic. And also there is a recommendation on bluefin farming. It was not a very needy recommendation, it was surely much less than Advisory Committee would have what liked, especially the U.S. delegation as a whole.

There is slightly improved data collection and reporting but observers are not required for the transfer of fish from purse seine to the cages and there is no provision for direct measurement of bluefin transferred from the vessel. So again, a lot of the bluefin in the Mediterranean are going to these operations and we don't have a very good handle on the size of the fish that are going into it, the mortality associated with the transfer process or the caging process. And those are the things that you would like

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to have.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so hopefully we can get some stronger measures in the years to come. How free are the (inaudible) tuna south, but southern bigeye has its own commission, so we're only looking at southern Albacore here. Big news is that we went from a onea multiyear recommendation on southern year to albacore, but we still don't have country-specific catch limits.

The major harvesters work together and try and make sure that their combined catch stays below the MSY. This is -- and if they screw up they have decided to have an intercessional -- what they're doing here is they are avoiding the allocation issue. So the different countries, they don't want to have to sit there and argue about who's eventually going to get what, and they put that off as long as they possibly can.

Now for swordfish, billfish, and sharks, in the case of swordfish the current management measures were extended to 2006, so that you have assessment of northern and southern stocks of swordfish allocation discussions in 2006. In the case of marlin we wanted to postpone the assessment scheduled for 2005 until 2006 or 2007. The idea is to

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Deleted:

(202) 234-4433

-- so we can actually have enough time for countries to implement the management measures that were adopted in 2000.

Sometimes it takes a few years for those measures to be adopted or implemented through domestic policy and then you have to remember that ICCAT reporting is almost a year and a half late. And so if you actually want to see some of these reductions appear in the landing statistics, you will have to go out. And so we want to give the longest time period we can before the next assessment to see whether those reductions are actually occurring. And so based on the advice of the SCRS it was extended from 2005 until 2006. And the management measures, which are the release of all live white marlin and blue marlin, which should end up in a reduction of two-thirds in the landings of white marlin and 50 percent of blue marlin, went into place.

But as you can see now, if we go to 2006, we are going to have assessments and discussion of bluefin tuna, east and west; swordfish, north and south, blue marlin and white marlin. Now, that's a lot of assessments for the SCRS to do, but when we get down into the actual negotiations, the United States is going to have -- it's going to be a three-ring

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

circus and we'll have some vulnerability. So we really need to think in the Advisory Committee with U.S. delegations as to how we want to proceed with these to maximize our input on these stocks.

In terms of the sharks this was a big winter and at ICCAT we actually did get a recommendation that's binding, that the -- and this asserts ICCAT's management authority over sharks. And so ICCAT is for tuna and tuna-like fishes. There are some Atlantic sharks that have maintained elevated body temperatures, but that doesn't make them a tuna.

So what it does always is that the ICCAT is going to manage not only the target species, but the fisheries and those species which the fisheries interact with. And so full utilization -- so they have the fins priced no more than 5 percent of the weight that the shark carcasses on board. The SCRS will review the 5 percent that's marked this year; requires data collection research on nursery areas and encourages release of live sharks, shortfin mako -- there were some problems with the data.

One of the major countries that catches make sharks didn't have anyone there to really represent their data set and there'll be new assessments of shortfin make and blue sharks by 2007. So those were

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: n

Deleted: re

the four major species working groups and then ICCAT of course has two other major committees, the Permanent Working Group, which looks at essentially the performance of non-member fisheries, how they are doing, and the Compliance Committee, which looks at the compliance of the member nations.

So of course, Taiwan has been verv problematic and the fish laundering didn't help at And so their cooperating party status, which gives them some -- quite a few benefits, was almost turned down, but in the end they decided not to and them under identified the new trade resolution. And so they have one year to respond and to come back with a plan, and if ICCAT doesn't buy it, Taiwan could be in a real serious potential of losing their market and that can kill the fishes.

Singapore, which is the world's leading trader in swordfish was identified for failing to implement ICCAT statistical document program, so they have one year to correct that. And of course if they were shut down, then -- if they are identified then that closes all of the ICCAT nation markets to them or could potentially do that. Compliance -- well, I want to thank Chris first of all; for those of you that have been to ICCAT, you might understand what

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

compliance is.

Nations are supposed to have already submitted their compliance tables by the start of the meeting and so that we can see those who are out of compliance, but in general, usually about 20 -- 15 to 20 percent of the parties have actually submitted their compliance tables and then others come on, and during the meeting people start changing the numbers.

And Chris, in addition to his many other duties, sits on top of this. And so when we finally got into the discussions, was able to point out which countries should be saying something and we were able to make sure that a lot of those countries did in fact identify themselves saying yes, we had an overharvest here, it occurred because of this and this is what we are doing to correct it. So that part of the Compliance Committee went well.

We had a lot of -- the U.S. had a lot of items that we wished to accomplish here. We'd like to get a recommendation for 5 percent observer coverage and that would be by day or trip. There was great resistance to that and the best we could do was by vote. But what does that mean? If you have an observer on a boat for one day out of the year then 75 percent of the boats in your fleet would be nothing.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So they weren't willing to buy on by trip or by day so that didn't mean much. And so we just let drop.

When an increased information on pelagic longline here, actually just about the terminal tackle and the gadgets, but the EC put a --

(<u>Tape Interruption</u>)

MR. GRAVES: Fishing vessels that are 23.9 meters. So, you know, you want to keep a handle on the effort. In general there was support for this, but the people -- you know, there's a whole bunch of different recommendations that are based on the 24-meter length, and so countries wanted a chance to evaluate this with all that. At the next meeting countries will report on the number of vessels they have within -- between 15 and 24 meters and then there may be a chance to go ahead and have a binding international measure.

The EC wanted a global restriction on the carry forward of underused or unused quota. But in the end people felt it was better to deal with this rather than on a global basis, on a stock-by-stock basis. And finally three different then transshipment proposals submitted were and considered, but in the end none of them were selected for it. So that's something that we have to continue

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: try

Deleted: t

Deleted: i

Deleted: wa

Deleted: on

with, is to clamp down on transshipment and to make sure we can avoid this fish laundering problem that we have. So we have to have good counting.

And Chris, that was probably about 12 minutes. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them at the break, I want Chris to go on. If you'd like the longer copy of this particular presentation that has it in more detail, you could ask Erica Carlson. Erica -- and she will make sure that you get it. Thanks a lot.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you very much, John. We'll take this two minutes off of your presentation for next year, in the spirit of the Compliance Committee overharvest/underharvest.

Yes, I was just going to call folks' attention to the document itself.

All right, we had a couple of questions on the consolidation of the two plans and exactly where we would discuss that. This is the point that we had identified in the agenda. Why don't you just tilt it a little bit? Thank you, that's fine.

We had issued a HMS plan back in 1999 that includes -- included swordfish, sharks, and tunas. What we were reacting to was the Fishery Conservation Amendments of 1996, the Sustainable Fisheries Act,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE N.W.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted:

Deleted: SPEAKER:

Deleted: MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

which not only required that the Secretary of Commerce convene advisory panels for the plans under secretarial jurisdiction, but also indicated a date, certain so to speak, a timeframe, get on with it so to speak, I guess was the best way Congress told us to get that tuna plan in place.

We had the authority since 1992 but hadn't completed a tuna plan. So there was a clear marching order from Congress to get on with the tuna plan, but also to convene an advisory panel for each of the plans under secretarial responsibility.

At the time we looked at consolidation rather than setting up advisory panels for each plan and keeping the plans separate. The Secretary had inherited swordfish and billfish from the South Atlantic Council as the lead for the five councils, and it already issued a shark plan under secretarial authority. At the time we thought that combining all the species except for billfish was an appropriate approach given the unique nature of billfish as a game fish status only.

I guess you could say, at least from the staff prospective, that decision did have some implications throughout the process insofar as we did convene two separate panels, one for billfish, one

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

for HMS, had separate meetings, sometimes joint meetings. But a lot of concern was raised about the need for addressing certain issues affecting billfish in the HMS plan and vice versa.

That concern has continued to manifest itself throughout the years, post implementation of 1999, and in the view of the Agency it was diminishing efficiency of the staff in getting the rules out. For the most part we've had the panels meet in joint session over the last several years, and any aspects of controlling billfish mortality through the recreational fishery.

The directed mortality have repercussions in the HMS plan because we tend to manage the HMS fisheries as a unit. We now have a consolidated HMS permit for both the charter boat sector and the private recreational vessels.

And likewise any control of billfish mortality as a bycatch mortality in the commercial sectors was addressed in the other plan, but the bycatch reduction plan required under National Standard 9 of the Magnuson Act had repercussions in the other plan as well. So it was clear that we really were not in a position to address any issues, if any at all, but certainly not many in any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: able

substantive way by addressing one plan or the other.

And that in almost all cases we would have to address the issues in both plans and therefore convene the two panels in joint session.

So again looking at efficiency of operations, the public understanding of the process, a lot of folks would be looking in the HMS plan for billfish matters and we'd have to call their attention to the fact -- well, that particular element is in the billfish plan, not in the HMS plan or vice versa sometimes.

So we'll now go to the next line. So we looked seriously about the ability to meet our goals in terms of the management arena. And it make sense to consolidate; we certainly felt it did make sense to consolidate. This in fact is addressed at great length in your pre-draft document beginning on page 31, I believe. Actually on page 27, it starts, on just the background and the rationale for combining the two plans.

It does have a current table of the representation of the panels and then a substantive discussion on the objectives in a combined FMP. And I believe this is what was the heart of the matter that Russ Nelson wanted to have some opportunity to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: It didn't

Deleted: n't

Deleted:

discuss. So again the regulations were previously consolidated back in 1999, so the Atlantic Highly Migratory Species regulations addressing all the species including billfish were all consolidated under that new part 635.

But we did have the two plans separate and the two panels separate, but again dealing with the ongoing issues, ongoing fisheries, management felt that it was very difficult to address one plan without the other and have the discussions without both the panels present.

So when we looked at what the practical implications were other than increasing efficiency and reducing redundancy, one of the things that jumped out was the advisory panels themselves, the other thing was the objectives. Let me deal with the panels themselves. What we anticipated doing was to just consider everybody who was here present, whether they were here because of their representation on the billfish panel or the HMS panel to be a member, whether appointed or ex-officio, under the new combined panel.

Then deal with rebalancing if necessary, the Act, Magnuson Act does speak to balanced representation. That's about the only guidance

Deleted:

Deleted:

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

regarding the assembly of the advisory panels, a balanced representation of all interest. With respect to rebalancing we will deal with that through the normal process.

Normally what we have is an announcement in November indicating those terms which are expiring in December each year, and requesting nominations. So during that process in November of 2005, we will call everybody's attention to the combined panels in looking at the rebalancing issue in terms of nominations.

Another issue with respect to the panels is that the billfish panel was currently constructed to have two-year terms, with half the terms expiring each year. The HMS being a little bit larger panel, three-year terms with one-third of the members expiring each year. So again, we would keep the expiration dates the same for any current panel member and then do that rebalancing, reconfiguring with the next round of nominations.

So again, it would be a three-year term for any new appointees, but some of those originally assembled from the billfish panel may have terms that expire a little bit sooner rather than later. So we may have to address that in terms of the balancing

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

act with respect to the expiration of terms, as we do that nomination process.

Again, we did not envision that warranted much discussion here at this meeting. The more substantive issue would be the objectives. What we have laid out in the pre-draft, beginning on the bottom of the page 33, is a side-by-side comparison of the objectives currently embodied in the tuna, swordfish and shark, aka HMS FMP, and then the objectives embodied in the billfish FMP as separate entities.

And then we've proposed some language which we feel picks up on any of the salient differences between the two in a way that captures them both to the extent that resulted in some redundancies. So we have proposed that some objectives can be eliminated by virtue of being addressed in one or the other consolidated objectives. So again, that table is quite explicit, the different language from either the billfish or the HMS FMP is highlighted for your review. And again, the proposed consolidated language is there in the third column.

I think that's -- is there one more slide on this subject? Just to review, again, the Act does require a balanced representation. We currently

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: down

have, on each AP -- although I believe this needs to be updated because of our appointment for Pete Manuel in the last week or so. So that would be a 10 commercial HMS FMP or AP, recreational 4, 2 and 1, academic and the ICCAT chair. They can only do one ICCAT chair in the combined panel, so you can't find a clone for yourself, John.

The billfish AP is currently 2 commercial, 4 recreational, 1 environmental, and 2 academic. Now, the ex-officio representatives for the states and the councils would remain unchanged. They would be at the discretion of the State Council Commission office to designate who would come to the meeting. I think probably the Gulf council is the only council that has routinely named a separate party to the billfish and HMS APs. And most other councils have consolidated their representation, so to speak, in terms of appointing one individual to attend the meeting.

So some implications with regard to rebalancing, but again it was our intent to address that rebalancing through that normal nomination process that occurs every year. So I think that the more useful discussion at this point would be for folks, if you haven't done so, I hope you've had at

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

least a chance to skim them, but to quickly take a look at that table of the consolidated objectives and see where we go from there, whether or not the consolidated language that is proposed seems to do the trick and alleviates any concerns of the nuances of the language that had evolved into separate plans.

Or if you have any concerns about dropping any of those particular objectives.

But that's the issue in a nutshell as we see it. Again, the intent is not to change anything about the management approaches for billfish, tuna, swordfish, or sharks, it is merely an administrative function to operate more efficiently, especially in an era that I think we can all agree is not going to be resource-rich.

We're going to have to be a lot smarter in how we address and apply resources to do regulatory amendments and plan amendments. So with that I would invite any comments regarding the consolidation in general, but in particular, the consolidation of the plan objectives. Ellen Peel?

MS. PEEL: I'll start this off; I'm sure there will be other comments. Looking at all the objectives and your rationale, it appears that the rationales are primarily for administrative

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

expediency. There's not a great deal that is fish-specific. When you have recommended to delete the two key objectives of the billfish plan, I think it makes your intent very clear that you're trying to reduce billfish species to merely a by-thought, as a bycatch species within the HMS plan.

You can have the two panels continue to meet together, but you are going to eviscerate the efficiency of the billfish plan to do anything to conserve and improve the status of the stocks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Which two key objectives are you referring to? 13 and 14.

MS. PEEL: 13 and 14 on page 36.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: And you do not feel that they are adequately captured in 2, 4, 5, and 7, under the consolidated column?

MS. PEEL: Those elements were already in the billfish plan. As they were somewhat restated in the other plan, very broad language, in large part adopted from the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The objectives of the billfish plan are clearly spelled out in those two that you've wiped out, or that you would like to wipe out.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, Russ Dunn.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE N.W.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. NELSON: It's Nelson.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Oh, excuse me, Russ Dunn. Russ Nelson, I'm sorry. Too many Russells on my mind.

MR. NELSON: I'll defer to Russell Dunn if he's got something to bring into this conversation, that's all right with me. I mean, I don't see a major problem in consolidating a plan. understand the ease -- you know, that could make things easier. Although it's not terribly unique amongst -- in this nation's fisheries to have to deal with two different plans to solve problems in fisheries. You've got red snapper and Gulf shrimp in two different plans in the Gulf of Mexico. bycatch and this new step towards more ecosystemapproaches to fishery increases the connectivity between plans.

But frankly, I do agree with what Ellen said. I mean by suggesting that you can remove Objective 13 and 14, you essentially dramatically dilute the fact that the billfish plan is a management plan which has allocated that fishery directly and explicitly to the recreational sector. And has made certain statements about where primary management objectives should be directed to reduce

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: gold

Deleted:

bycatch and increase the availability of those fish.

And I would -- I mean, I've got a little bit of pride of ownership in this. I was around when that thing was done. I even got to vote twice on it, at the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. But for instance, Objective 13, the highest availability of billfishes, this stemmed from a long discussion when -- amongst multiple councils about the fact that maximizing benefit in the recreational fishery is largely a matter of increasing encounter rates, particularly in a fishery like billfish where the fish are not routinely or hardly ever maintained, but encounter rates is the that provide the opportunity and the economic and social benefits.

So I'm not going to belabor the point but you said on page 33 in the preface to the table -- "Carry unique objectives into the combined HMS FMP unchanged." Well, as I read this, there is not a single unique objective that was carried into the -- under your recommendation, that would be carried into their plans.

So I would just say that if the Agency wants to readdress the allocation question in terms of billfish and how this nation manages the billfish fishery, then I think it should be a very explicit

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: cannot

part of the briefing document. Because, at least as I read it, by removing those two unique objectives, you essentially have removed that from the forefront of this management plan to a questionable status.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right. Just to that point, it seems to me that we could probably modify the proposed consolidated Objective number 4 to include a refinement so to speak of optimum yield with respect to what had been 13, maintaining the highest availability. As a measure of optimum yield, something to that effect.

SPEAKER: Well, there is a lot of ways to change this and I'm sure that you will be receiving some written comments but frankly I recommend you just keep 13 and 14 in there as objectives which specifically refer to billfish.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Yes, fair enough. Ken Hinman and then Mike Leech.

MR. HINMAN: Thank you, Chris. Yes, I agree with both Ellen and Russell on this. You say earlier in the document on the implications of these -- of a consolidation. And again, I'll reiterate what Russ said on the consolidation per se. I don't have a problem with that at all. I think it makes a lot of sense and for a lot of reasons. But you say

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: to

that this will incorporate all of the existing management measures from the two FMPs into the new consolidated FMP.

And -- but I would suggest that by changing the objectives for billfish, 13 and 14 in particular, that it seems to $\underline{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{e}$ very likely that that could lead to future changes in the management measures as regards to billfish, because you have essentially -and I was around with Russ at the time this was written. So I feel a little pride of ownership too, that I think a lot of people who worked on this consider those two objectives really the heart of the billfish plan in many ways. That this is --

So I would suggest that I don't see why you cannot have a consolidated plan with different objectives for different species. You have different optimum yields for different species and you can incorporate these objectives into those definitions.

So, you know, that's the way I feel about that. As far as consolidating the APs, it looks like you don't even have to revisit it in terms of balance.

If -- you know, if you've got 10 commercial, 10 recreational and 5 environmental, I would be curious to see how you would propose in the future, just you know, trying to rebalance that.

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > www.nealrgross.com

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 Deleted: b

Deleted: why I feel that bad

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That seems pretty balanced.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, thank you. We did feel that it was pretty balanced in its consolidated state as well, but again we would take comments on that in our November request for nominations for expiring terms, whether or not there is a general view that in its combined stature, it is in need of rebalancing or not. But I do agree that just because the plans are consolidated doesn't mean we can't have unique objectives for some of the components of the plan.

What seems to have occurred is that the references to optimum yield are not as specific in their consolidated format with respect to the billfish, in terms of the highest availability, and as Russ Nelson put it, maximizing encounter rates. So it certainly would be two options of trying to work some more explicit language into some of the other objectives or maintaining them separately. In other words just carrying forward 13 and 14 as currently written. Mike Leech?

MR. LEECH: I think NMFS is trying to combine apples and oranges here. You've implied that the two HMS and billfish are interrelated. Well, yes, they all swim in the same ocean, but the HMS

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

management has been pretty much aimed at how many fish we can take out of the ocean and sell and still be sustainable whereas the billfish plan is the exact opposite. It's how many fish can we leave in the ocean to benefit the recreational fishery.

And if you combine those two, billfish are going to lose, recreational anglers are going to lose and other than -- maybe you can be more efficient up here. It's never been a major concern before it took four years to get an emergency shark management plan. That doesn't seem like a strong argument for me.

Public confusion over management process, there's probably not one person in a thousand that understands the management process now, nor will they understand it any better in the future. And when you talk about deleting 14 and 13 you are absolutely gutting the billfish management plan. And trying to reword it and do anything else is only going to weaken it. There's not a single recreational angler that I have talked to that would be in favor of this.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thanks, Mike. Bobbi Walker, then Rick Weber.

MS. WALKER: Thanks Chris. The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council voted unanimously to object to splitting the plans. We deal with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: en

Deleted: ned

Deleted:

multiple FMPs all the time and we strongly feel that the billfish species is what's going to lose. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Bobbi. Rick Weber?

MR. WEBER: Just to echo what everyone else has said, my strong preference would be to have them That said, I think the economies of the separate. day are going to say that they are going to end up being combined. I'd like to just give you an idea to explore for the future and that would be some form of compromise here. I want to say species working group or some such thing, where rather than meeting as a single panel, where people with various expertises are sitting, waiting sometimes half a day for their turn. Perhaps we would be more efficient if we spent one day in more species specific or group specific discussions with your individual leaderships in each of those specialties, and then come back in a second day or a third day and discuss how we bring all of these ideas back together into a single management.

Because I certainly feel that this document as it was written gave the recs some stronger privileges when it came to the marlin, that it did clearly allocate that to them, and I don't want to go

Deleted: and

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

back to a 50-50 discussion on this because the document has never said that, just ideas for you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, thanks Rick. We had discussed in several past panel meetings this notion of breaking up into sub groups. I think most often that was raised when we were getting into the nitty-gritty of bluefin tuna allocation and certainly putting some members at a disadvantage who weren't familiar with all the categories and size classes and things like that and certainly that's the model that the ICCAT advisory committee follows with these species working groups. So we're certainly open to any suggestions on the part of the panel members and maybe at the end of the meeting when we do have a little bit of time towards the end of -- for the wrapup, we can talk about that in the context of a consolidated panel whether or not revisiting species working groups would be a good idea as an efficiency for the meeting. Any other comments, I think the loud and clear regarding maintaining the objectives 13 and 14 in the combined list so to speak. Let Rusty go and then Michael Leech again.

MR. HUDSON: Rusty Hudson, Directed Shark Fisheries. Back in 1999, when you consolidated the shark plan into the HMS plan, we in the shark

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: ese

Deleted:

Deleted: ing

industry, environmentalists and the commercial in particular didn't want that. Because we felt like the 39 species that we were managing would somehow become what I referred to as a redheaded stepchild and that sort of is the case, because in a lot of ways most people don't understand the number of species and the different details involved there.

And so we felt like we will be taking the back seat to tunas and swordfish, it is the same way we still feel nearly six years later. Now we are going to add billfish into a further response and this is just going to make us feel again more complicated. I had been asked when this consolidation was referred to as amendment 2 last year to comment against consolidation to at least just leave well enough alone. And I can see the concerns of the recreational component, you know, that from a commercial point of view, we have a couple commercial members on there and we discussed the bycatch issues that come up. generally speaking, for the U.S. this is recreational issue when we get into billfish. And the other part of my observation was the fact that this was amendment 2 to begin with and we had some outstanding issues with amendment 1 that still had not been completed.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I get a feeling that lot of this is folding over into 2006 and she was looking for a January 1st implementation time. So again I feel like from the perspective of 39 species of shark, we're on the backburner again, and I wish that there was a way to get away from that a little bit, Rick's suggestion about the working groups that are species oriented might be useful at times. There are times like amendment 1 where the entire process was dominated with shark. This time we got everything, kitchen sink in this little telephone book and by the time we get proposed rules of summer, I'm sure it's going to thicken up a little bit more so just a point of view from us.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Rusty. Mike Leech?

MR. LEECH: Jimmy Donofrio of Recreational Fishing Alliance came in a little late to get a seat at the table but he just asked me to go on record as stating that goals 13 and 14 must stay in there. You got to keep in mind when this was created in 1988, it took years to get it done and it was a five council agreed upon plan that came up with this very strong and very clear language. And it just needs to be kept in there, not folded into something else and watered

Deleted: right

Deleted: end of

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

down.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you. Sonja Fordham?

MS. FORDHAM: Thank you. Sonja Fordham of The Ocean Conservancy. I wanted to take this opportunity to agree with Rusty about the shark shrift bit. And I remind you that there are a lot of sharks and under this plan a lot of them have serious problems and we only have really one species dealt with_in this pre-draft. So we would hope that you would go back and reconsider at least giving us a little bit more focus times or breaking out so that the shark issues can be addressed in the consolidation. Thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, any more comments. Ken Hinman?

MR. HINMAN: Yes, one more. Just to make sure that this isn't just about, well, we've gotten into shark, so it's not just about billfish and the recreational fishery, I think there is a number of other things as I look through here and we'll include them in our written comments that you really have to be careful that you don't give short shrift to any species or to any particular groups of fisherman when you consolidate and when you try to bring objectives

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

together, you have to really understand the full implications and I'm just pointing out number 18 here.

The existing HMS FMP does include language about including access for traditional swordfish, handgear fishermen to participate fully as the stock recovers and that particular objective of swordfish part of the HMS FMP is proposed to be deleted encompassed in a larger over capacity latent effort, economic efficiency type objective which I don't think comes close to capturing that original intent of that objective for the New England swordfish harpoon fishery in particular but also the rod and reel fishery. So I think those things have to -- you can't just jettison them without understanding the full implications or the original intent.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: So would you propose that we maintain 18 or try to do a better job of being a little bit more explicit in 16 to that issue of the handgear fisheries.

MR. HINMAN: I really don't care what number it has. I think the language that is in 18 needs to be maintained in some form.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Ken. Bob Zales?

MR. ZALES: Yeah, we pretty much support

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

everything that has been said here and we -- from the far side of this on the Gulf of Mexico, we really support what the gov -- the action that they took on this, and kind of like what Rusty said in some species of fish in the Gulf of Mexico, we kind of feel like the redhead stepchild too, especially like -- with the elephant tuna and what not. We're kind of concerned that if this thing gets consolidated with billfish that billfish could go on in the same way because in the gulf for some reason that we don't -- we get the attention that we need down there in many cases. So, you know, we've got a concern where that goes. Billfishing is a substantial activity in the Gulf of Mexico. And we just want to be sure that it doesn't get lost in the shelf.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you. Gail Johnson?

MS. JOHNSON: Thanks Chris. It doesn't say specifically and -- when you're talking about the membership, can I take it that the number of members of the consolidated -- if it were consolidated would they -- would there still be as many people? So you weren't thinking of saving money by cutting out some of the members?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, again,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Deleted: 2

Deleted:

www.nealrgross.com

the only quidance in Magnuson is that we convene a panel of balanced representation, there is no minimum number and there is no maximum number. It's just a matter of budget and efficiency in running a meeting, trying to represent not only the commercial, recreational, environmental and academic sectors, but also to have some geographic balance recognizing that recreational issues in New England may be very difficult recreational issues in the Gulf of Mexico. So it's a tough balancing act, but obviously when the committee gets to be too large and unwieldy it's not going to be **efficient** in its operation.

Deleted: fishing

Currently that's what we were thinking that combining the two panels doesn't really deviate too much from what we felt was balanced representation in each panel separately. So that that was probably about the number that would be necessary for a combined panel to be of balanced representation. And again we would take comments on whether individuals felt that the recreational or commercial or regional components needed to be increased when we go out for nominations in November. Any other comments on consolidation, particularly objectives? We're at break_point on our agenda. I'd encourage those who haven't yet signed in to do so during the break. Joe

Deleted: ff

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

McBride?

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, thank you, Chris. Just in my ignorance, and I was just talking to Sonja to see if she knew the answer and may be I'm wrong. But administratively you want to for whatever reason, administratively consolidate both groups and I don't see too much opposition to the consolidation. But wouldn't it have been smarter for you certainly to speak to the members of the billfish sector to find out what they would object to or not object to if nothing else to say for half hour.

Because no one here has -- no one here has -- no one here on either side of the fence so to speak has said any good about leaving out, you know, 13,__14, et cetera. You know, unless I'm missing something that was a scoping on this but no one seems to say there was prior to this meeting and no one discussed anything openly. That may just make more sense before the agency would go out and put a proposal like that and they would talk to the people most pertinently affected by it, so I don't know. And that's as a taxpayer but there is no fee for this. This is all free.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Joe. We did go out so to speak at the public of in

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: agreements

Deleted: have

Deleted: i

the scoping process and this was the outcome of it. We did want to touch <u>base</u> with the persons most familiar with the history of billfish at the panel meeting because of the need to have that open discussion with the panel. Ellen?

MS. PEEL: To that point, Chris, the scoping meetings were held, I mean, I forgot how many you had, however, I can recall a number of them were on the very night of the captain's meetings of some of the most popular billfish tournaments in other parts of town. Now anyone that's fishing a billfish tournament is not going to forgo a captain's meeting and the requirements to be at the tournament to come to a scoping meeting. So your timing once again when it came to billfish was not good. I don't know how many billfish anglers showed up at each meeting.

But several, several meetings, I know I was at tournaments, I couldn't attend these scoping meetings. I had the benefit of being on the panel, so I knew what would be discussed but a lot of our members were not there because of the scheduling.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you. Again, we've heard loud and clear the importance of maintaining not only 13 and 14 with respect to billfish but 18 with respect to swordfish in handgear

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: pac

Deleted: ould

Deleted: erm

Deleted:

(202) 234-4433

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

fisheries, so with that we'll take a break, and again I would encourage those who haven't signed in please do so and pick up the nice folders that they'll put together for you. And we will be back here in about 15 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

SPEAKER: Thank you, Chris. Sorry, I think I turned you off. It wouldn't be the first time. Is that better? I guess the first -- I really don't how to start with questions or comments, but the first question is if the pumping season extends through July, why did we elect to open it, why did you elect to open it July 1, instead of our proposed August 1, that's one question.

The other thing is I've got a real problem with using historical catch data to set these quotas. If we did that to manage the summer flounder quota in North Carolina we would be hung from a tree. What we run the risk of doing here is by opening, for example, in the South Atlantic on July 1st and allowing it to run through August and then having the start period set up to start September 1 and run through December 5th, you run a real risk of having some severe overharvest in the South Atlantic, and by doing that that's taken off in the subsequent years' quotas.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Deleted: tape interruption

And it's like this year, in the first trimester, you'll notice that only 60 percent of the quota was taken before it was closed, leaving 40 percent on the table, and it would seem to me that if you're going to have -- if you are going to manage by quota, you need to have the mechanisms in place to track that quota to allow full utilization of each trimester's sub-quota allocation, rather than run into risk of having these large overages and underages by basing it on historical information.

Now if you continue to operate under a say a trimester next, how would you do next first trimester? If we only landed 60 percent in the first trimester this year, what does the historical record become, and how do you to deal with that the following year?

So it creates a real problem, and I am unaware of any other quota monitoring process that does it this way. Most of us have to monitor to quote on a weekly or daily basis in some fisheries to try to keep the fisheries open as long as we can, because what's happening right now with the shark quotas is small as they have got to protect the resource, responsibly so.

We've got guys who are trying to gear up.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Fisheries closing with fish left over, and they are forced to go into other fisheries that we really don't want them going into, like pelagic long lining where we're catching large dusky sharks and having to throwing them back over which is totally contrary to the intent purpose behind. The quota reductions in the trimester quota monitoring process. So I guess is there any approach to try to go forward the more accurate and timely quota monitoring system and what's the justification for opening July 1 when you indicate that the prawn pumping season is July.

SPEAKER: Take those questions, Chris.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, we do have a bi-weekly reporting periods, we're not down to a weekly basis yet, but that's something that we could strive for. And I agree that it's always good to have shorter time frame quota monitoring but we also certain limitations in terms of doing that.

As you know, any of the over -- under harvest from one season or carried over to the same season of the following year and we feel like that's worked pretty well. I know you referred to the 60 percent quota harvest number and that's actually gone up now for the Gulf of Mexico, the -- at least for this first trimester season of this year. Same with

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the South Atlantic quotas, we've been fairly close to what the quota was, it was established for each of those regions in previous years. So that's one comment I have in terms of the carry over of harvest. And your question regarding the shark pumping season as you know, North Carolina is one of the prime shark pumping areas on the South Atlantic coast, that area is going to be closed until the end of July regardless.

So I think that was a part of the rationale for going ahead and opening July 1 for the rest of the South Atlantic region. With North Carolina then opening August 1. Does that answer your question, Louis?

MR. DANIEL: Yes, somewhat, but I'm still concerned with the understanding that I thought we had about the second, third trimester openings and that North Carolina would have full access to the second and third trimester since we're shut out of the first trimester, at least for the time being.

So -- and my real concern is that recognizing that the shark guys of North Carolina are going to need to try to make up as best they can, I know that's difficult to do but try to have to make up for a January through July closure when we finally

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

open up off North Carolina in August.

You know, I have real concerns that there's going to be a significant amount of harvest in that August sub period that might have been off-set had we opened August 1st. So I guess we'll have to wait to see what happens, but certainly I would want to go on record as being in opposition to the July 1 opening, and put in preference to an August 1st opening for the second trimester.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Chris, why don't you just make one more brief comment? Based on the catch rates that we've looked at over the last couple of years and the fact that North Carolina would be closed, North Carolina has historically accounted for approximately 50 percent of the landings in the South Atlantic region. If we were to open the South Atlantic region on August 1, the quota would not be landed within that one-month period before the third trimester season kicked off.

So therefore starting it on July 1, however, does result in the quota being landed during that two-month period prior to the start of the third trimester season. And so North Carolina is the only place where there is a concern about catching pups during July.

SPEAKER: Not the only place, but one of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the primary places, that's correct.

SPEAKER: Bob McAuliffe? Is your mike working?

MR. McAULIFFE: Here we go, is that better?
You have South and North Atlantic, I am assuming
from what he just said that it is not south of five
degrees but actually just south of Carolina. But
this was a bit confusing to me, but my main question
is where does the Caribbean fit into this picture?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: That would be included in the Gulf of Mexico quota.

MR. McAULIFFE: Okay, because we are not in the Gulf of Mexico, that's why I asked the question. But we are very similar to that, and we really need to have the Caribbean separated out with its own quota, because we simply don't fit into any of these groups, and there is no historical data to speak of yet shark like the other HMS is primary food. Every shark that's caught is consumed from tip to tail. And as Nemesis (phonetic) demonstrated they can clean these things up like last year we spoke out about the Marlin problem in Puerto Rico, you guys got that cleaned up real fast.

Now if you start tracking down on the other HMS fisheries in the Caribbean, Caribbean fishermen

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

are in trouble because we've really just been operating on our own with no records and nothing else, but if you want it, count us, and get us in the regular quotas, we're going to have to change the whole program for the Caribbean. Either bring us online or forget about us and leave us alone. Those are the two basic options.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Any other comments on the proposed quotas? Rusty Hudson?

MR. HUDSON: Rusty Hudson, Directed Shark Fisheries. I submitted a written comment this past Friday and in general a lot in the industry that I'd spoke with, at least felt encouraged on one level that we were going to have a little more time to catch some fish.

We were a little discouraged with the July 1st opening, because of how it handicaps the North Carolina guys. The July 15th opening anyway would allow them to go ahead and venture into the North Atlantic region which is just across the Virginia-North Carolina line, and that will give them an opportunity to fish there for the two weeks and then drop back into the Gulf of Mexico unless, I mean, back into the closed area off North Carolina. Unless of course you're considering later modifying the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

zone, you know, because you got us all the way out to 55 fathoms.

As far as -- like what Bob brought up, he is talking about an artificial fishery because you got one incidental shark permit down there in Virgin Islands, I don't know if any of that's changed from what I see in this book, but no directed, and yet what he just told you is that it's consumed for food on a pretty regular basis, so there has to be some monitoring. I would be venturing to guess that while we have the proliferation of Atlantic sharpnose, they have a proliferation of Caribbean sharpnose, which you all had stuck on the prohibited species list back in 1999.

And we said then that is according to some of the sharks of the world manuals, that is one of the more common sharks. I thought the Caribbean was being included in the South Atlantic Code, but I -- you know, you say Gulf of Mexico, so -- likewise I am a little fearful to even mention the same about we might overrun and then we get whacked next year because the environmentalist and ourselves and certain other folks had signed off on a document almost two years ago, wanting to have an assessment every two years.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Our assessment that was hopefully going to be conducted in 2004, we shifted to 2005, and now reading this document I find that the final results of the sciences here wont be available till 2006, and the small coastal assessment will not be completed till 2007. I keep hearing lack of money. I keep looking at the fact that you got almost every species a large coastal identified as overfished and overfishing still occurring even though we know that's not true in that 12 years of management has benefited those animals.

The small coastal quota is excessive in the fact that you had a small number of gill net boats that established that. Now that gillnet boat group has virtually been cut in half from the original group of 11 down to about 5. And I sensed that with the Gulf of Mexico, some of those guys trying to show that they can catch so small coastal so it would help to go ahead and shift a little more quota over their way because you are not and have not caught the small coastal quota ever and you keep -- going to have to add it on, add it on, add it on, you're going to just making it bigger and bigger and bigger.

So I would like to do some for the North Carolina guys because they have been handicapped

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

economically. Your 21 percent downsize in our economic last year between the hurricanes and a variety of other things round up being 35 percent plus and that hurt us over on the east coast with a lot other people. And we would like to, you know, help them out. That's the encouraging part that we felt with these dates, at least they had an opportunity to catch some animals, but if you don't get the science done, we feel strongly that if you were able to do a cursory assessment on all the species then at least we have a shot at increasing the quota.

We need to have the workshops so that you can prove that our 60 or 65 guys know the difference between a sandbar and a hammerhead because that was your excuse for rolling back from ridgeback and non-ridgeback management into the situation of the reaggregated thing and then you lowered the quota 600,000 pounds. That hurt us, and we keep getting hurt economically to the -- we're -- we're so marginal now that the profits aren't there. And we need to have a profit, that is the nature of business, and I've -- you know, stated this several times.

And so, I'm just feeling like we need to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

get the science, we need to get a schedule, I personally I'm trying to construct a industry assessment of all 22 large coastal shark species to have Enrique (phonetic) and the panel consider at the upcoming data workshop whenever that will be scheduled.

Because originally in December I was told that it would be scheduled for January, it's now end of March, and so we are in hurry up and wait mode. This consolidation wasn't exactly what we were expecting, we were expecting a minimum of two and we were expecting to be getting involved with trying to do the science, and I know I want to sit down and prove to the world that a lot of the prohibited species are not overfish and overfishing is not occurring.

Some of these animals are such rare vent animals that we don't see them and with a closed area off of Florida for the pelagic long-lines, you're not having that bycatch problem down that way anymore. There's a lot of reasons for taking a good hard look at each individual species and the reason why is because you keep telling Congress the same thing.

Overfishing is occurring and these stocks are overfished. Yet, we know better, we being the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

industry participants. Now that we've got two thirds of our catch identified as being sandbar and blacktip and neither of those are considered overfished anymore and blacktip is a situation where you are saying that is rebuilt. It's a good sign that the science was getting on track in 2002, and we really would have hoped to have that finished by 2004.

Now we are looking at maybe having a report the implementation of this document, independent review, whatever, and that 3-stage workshop stuff is a good thing because that helps you with your Data Quality Act situations, and I tried to work with you on the past year, I'm trying to correct where you get meat and fins folded together, I still see some of those problems here. I saw one-pound Caribbean Reef. I know that doesn't happen.

It doesn't exist like that. The carcass is going to weigh, you know, a little bit more than that, even if it is a neonate. And so these are the type of things that I am hoping that you'll look at, but the thing that Louis brought up a few minutes ago, this bi-weekly doing it every two weeks reports got to stop. You've got to get more real time reporting. One week is a good way to do it because a lot of fish are managed on a weekly basis. It will

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

give you a better finger on the pulse of what's going on with the fishery.

You're talking about 60 some odd boats that account for virtually all of the landings, a trip limit or more since or two trip limits or more since, you know, in a given year for large coastals, and now with the small coastal component, there is -- that's occurring in the Gulf of Mexico, I've got some concerns there. Somebody called me the other day, a dealer, and he says that they've been reporting their small coastals, which has been mostly allowing sharpnose and blacknose, its finetooth.

And again, you know, Enrique had said in his document that do not put too much credence in this finetooth assessment, because we did not include the bycatch numbers in a way to be able to really assess it. Now that's not even going to be re-addressed until 2007. So right now you're working off the old science, and we would like to see some of that get fast tracked. I keep being told just like John Hoe (phonetic) is working with that 30-year time series out of North Carolina, Frank Schwartz's.

I'd like to see that at the shark evaluation workshop this year. I remember what he said in his book from 2003 (italics) Sharks of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Carolina, that he doesn't agree with the dooming loom (phonetic) scientists. He feels that the sharks are in much better shape than a lot of people feel. If you haven't read the book, I recommend reading it, because it's a sort of testimonial of his life with sharks, and he has been excluded from the shark workshops that I can see.

I've seen some people belittle him for across 10 and 12 years and I'd just like to see his data pulled in here, because what's going on in Virginia, just like they're talking about this petition from North Carolina to try to modify the closed area. That closed area needs to extend up to Virginia and Delaware Bay, out 15 fathoms you need to drop it back from 55 fathoms back into 15 fathoms, Stewart Springer had mentioned this, it's a good thing to do. It's fair and so we're hoping that you'll take our comments to heart.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you Rusty, we've got -- do we? Anybody else on sharks then we've going to move on to the next presentation. Again we can come back to it as time allows. Do we? Okay, last comment on sharks and then we'll --

SPEAKER: When I look at the proposed 2005

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

regional quotas, it continues, I've had numerous conversations with Chris, but it continues to baffle me why National Marine Fisheries won't tell where these landings are coming from. They're not directed shark fish with the majority of them, they're probably come up from the State of Virginia into our fisheries.

And looking up here it seems like you are catering to a state fishery versus over federal permit holders. I think it would be in the best interest of National Marine Fisheries that you should put out all state landings with your stuff and be with transparency for this northern Atlantic what you said about adding to the quota, it's not quoted by directed shark fisherman, it's quote by the State Of Virginia and shark fisheries.

I would venture to say enough, done a little do research into it, I don't know why National Marine Fisheries continues making it look like it's called by shark fish, it must really ensure state fisheries, State of North Carolina closed their state waters, rebuilding, helping out, I see what they got us.

Number 2, I think that with these scenarios of all your sharks stuff, you'll just chill out for a while and see what -- you've done enough to us to see

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

what else will happen. Still all these split them up trimester quotas and you all can't even keep up what you've got now. So I just don't -- it just baffles me while you continue, I want to split it up more and when you look at the seasons where do you get your catch rates that come up with the December 15th season, they last that long when we never fish.

I think one time in '99 we fish to November, and I was close to some hurricane stuff. And a couple of times from October, so how in the world can you decide that seasons do last till December 15th in the South Atlantic, that's baffling to me.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Do we -- we had based it on historic catch rates from August and September in that region since that -- those were the most current and recent data that we had, that we had landings information from. So it's based on the average of August and September catch rates from previous years.

SPEAKER: The catch rates, I think you should look at maybe something different, what's going to happen when you go over? Where is that, you know, there could be a possibility of not being a shark season for the third trimester for years more.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I mean, you just look at the migration and the -- hey, I like it, but I noticed just what I liked. And nothing, everything, it just continues to baffle me of the -- of National Marine Fisheries and their management of these sharks. Just on the closure what is done through South-North Carolina, you know, it just continues more and the sharks aren't going out there. I was reading an article back then in Marlin Magazine where Mr. Leech was telling us about how these 19 sharks overfished.

The only reason what are classified as overfish because you've never done a stock assessment on it. So when you go read in the rhetoric and really know what's going on, there's two sides, but I think you all should really just chill out on your shark management, here you've got stuff in place, you've already decrease -- decreased this to what is hardly none of us left. You know, what could be next?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you. We'll make a transition here to our next proposed rule that is on ICCAT Trade Restrictive Measures. We'll take a brief comment on that, I don't imagine we'll have much to say because I get it spoken, we implement the recommendations, at least

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

they proposed to do so, but certainly if there is any comment, we would be pleased to take that at this time and then we'll move on to bluefin tuna '05 specifications. Megan Gamble? Take it away.

MS. GAMBLE: Thank you. As Chris really mentioned there were copies of three presentations handed out to each of you. One of them should be the presentation on the screen. If you don't happen to have a copy of this there are additional copies in the back room as well as copies of the proposed rule. And this proposed rule is to -- restricted trade measures as recommended at the 2004 ICCAT meeting. And the proposed rule was published on Tuesday, March 8th.

This proposal actually addresses two issues, and the first is to implement regulations in compliance with the 2004 ICCAT recommendations, and that is to lift Trade Restrictive Measures on the import of bigeye tuna from Cambodia, bigeye tuna and bluefin tuna from Equatorial Guinea and then bigeye tuna, bluefin tuna and swordfish from Sierra Leone.

And then the second part of this proposed rule is more housekeeping, correct some section references that conflict between two roles that were published in the federal register. The first was on

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

November 17th and the second was on December 6th.

There's a lot on this slide, but I wanted to give you a quick look at some of the trade restrictions that have been put in in the last two years, and the items in the red box at the bottom are the recommendations from the ICCAT that pertain to this proposed rule.

And as I said it before that would be to lift the import restrictions on Sierra Leone, Equatorial Guinea and Cambodia, and just to quickly let you know what's still in place is there is still prohibition on the bigeye tuna from Bolivia and bigeye tuna from Georgia. I am sorry, sorry.

And I thought I'd also let you know what these countries have done in order to have their trade restrictions lifted, Cambodia took the following actions that was to de-register vessels that were previously identified as conducting illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the convention area, they changed registry companies and then also they will not authorize other vessels to fish in the convention area.

Equatorial Guinea took the following actions that was to cancel licenses and files of large-scale longline vessels that previously were

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

participating in the IUU tuna fishing in the convention area. And then they guaranteed to comply with ICCAT conservation and management measures.

And then finally Sierra Leone addresses some concerns regarding data reporting, they developed a monitoring and control plan, and then finally will de-register vessels previously identified conducting IUU fishing in as the convention area.

And then as I mentioned before there is a second part to this proposed rule, there was a proposed rule that -- a final rule that was published in November and will become effective July 1, so that's later this summer. And that rule dealt with bigeye tuna statistical documents and the issue here is that it removed this Section 635.41 which was species subject to documentation requirements, they just changed that number. So there was a second final rule that dealt with trade restrictive measures and chartering permits.

And that second rule has references to that section number that was removed. So this is just some housekeeping to fix the section numbers, and those are all outlined in the proposed rule. So then I'm -- finally just want you to know that the public common

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

period for this proposed role ends on April 7th and comments will be accepted up until then and there are several different ways which you can send us those comments.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you,
Megan, any questions or comments on the ICCAT trade
restrictions, I see Russ Nelson, and was that Rick
Weber? No?

SPEAKER: I know this isn't directly -well it's related, but it's not part of the process,
but do we have any idea what happened to the vessels
that were de-flagged and de-registered?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, under the way I can operate, if they get re-registered and are misbehaving they can remain on the IUU list, but they will have to be nominated by somebody, typically Japan has done the most homework in this regard, they have tracked the vessels, followed them and we have had some issues with the Peoples' Republic of China in the past where a lot of these vessels were showing up on their registry and they would report to us, and others at ICCAT was that, well, it's better to have them in a controlled situation where we are claiming them and regulating them than to allow them to continue with flags of convenience. So we do have

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

some concerns on Chinese approach but for the most part as long as they're within their vessel limits and catch borders, which probably they haven't, it's not necessarily an issue that they pick up IUU vessels.

But again it's incumbent upon all ICCAT contracting parties to use their vessels siding and provide information prior to and at the annual meetings to determine whether vessels should remain on the IUU list regardless of who the current flag country is.

Any other comments, again to clarify that it's not the state of Georgia that was reference for bigeye tuna, that is former Soviet Republic of Georgia. All right, Megan, you got off easy at your first public hearing, we'll have to give you a more controversial subject next time.

Gwendell (phonetic) and he did have a question that he passed me, regarding the IUU list or positive list, the ICCAT is now maintaining two lists, one is authorized vessels, one is presumed IUU vessels. This proposed or the final rule that was issued in November last year, just prior to the ICCAT meeting is the rulemaking that allows us to discriminate based on vessels in terms of import

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

restrictions.

That will come into effect on July 1st this year, and we would use the bigeye and swordfish and bluefin statistical documents that -- section on the document that names the vessel, to compare, to authorized list and IUU list to see if it's admissible. So that would be effective in July 1 in 2005.

All right, our next subject always of interest, Dianne Stephan is going to lead us through the 2005 bluefin tuna quota specifications. Okay, I have a reminder here that the -- your comment is not restricted to this meeting here, you can certainly give us the comment on the presentations as well as these proposed rules in writing up to the goals of the comment period.

MS. STEPHAN: Thanks Chris. My name is Dianne Stephan, and I am with the Gloucester Field Office of the Highly Migratory Species Division. I'm going to be reviewing the bluefin tuna specifications for the 2005 fishing year, which are currently available for review and comment.

I'll briefly discuss their contents and then we'll open the floor for discussion. You may note on your agenda that this is identified as a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

public meeting rather than a public hearing. The specifications went to the federal register on Friday, and since we have to give two weeks notice before we can call this as an official public hearing, it's actually a public meeting.

However, I will be taking your comments into the record. The baseline allocation for the 2005 specifications is set based on the allocation which we received from ICCAT which is currently still based on a recommendation from 2002 and we take that amount and apply the percentages for each category based on what was set forth in the 1999 FMP. So the allocation from ICCAT is done in the bottom right hand corner 1489.6 metric tons.

From this number we subtract 25 metric tons which is set aside for catches for the longline category in what was identified as the vicinity of the management area boundary which we call the -- which we have decided as the NED, so the remainder we apply the percentages from the 1999 FMP to -- for the general category, the FMP states that 47.1 of this allocation will be used and that amount comes to 689.8 metric tons for the base line quarter for 2005.

And then you can just follow the columns down for the rest of the categories. In addition to

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the baseline quarter we look at overharvest or underharvest that occur during the previous year. For overharvest, any overharvest that occurred, we can either subtract the overharvest from the individual category in which that overharvest occurred or we can cover the overharvest from the reserve category.

Likewise for the -- if any underharvests occurred, we can add the remaining quarter to the same category for the following year or we can allocate it to the reserve category. So in order to understand what we are going to be doing for 2005, we need to take a look at what happened in 2004, the first column of numbers is the final -- initial 2004 specifications, which were just finalized this month, the next column indicates any in-season adjustments that occurred during 2004, and I'll run down this column for you.

We moved -- we removed 2223.1 metric tons from the general category and 76.9 metric tons from the general category, 40 metric tons from the harpoon category, 100 from the purse seine category and 45 metric tons from the longline category. 223.1 metric tons were added into the angling category and the rest of all the removals were added into the reserve

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

category. So the result is the third column of numbers and also the following column of numbers is the 2004 catch and note -- please note that this is as of January 19th of this year.

So there are several categories that were still open, more specifically the longline category and the angling category. So this is basically not including any of the numbers that we get from our North Carolina tagging data. So our final over -underharvest for 2004 is the final column on the right and includes 16 metric tons of underharvest for the general category, so the underharvests are all in black, overharvest is in red, eleven and a half for the harpoon category, about 258 metric tons for the Purse seine category, 85 for the longline category, 2.3 for the trap, 59.4 metric tons of overharvest in the angling category and then we have quite a bit that we're carrying over from the reserve, 298.3 metric tons in the reserve, which brings us to the table that indicates the proposed initial quarter allocations for 2005.

Two of the columns in this table, you guys have already seen, the first column is the overage and underage which carry over some 2004 which we just looked at in the last table, and then the third

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

column over which is baseline '05 is from the first table and that's just the -- the straight percentages from the FMP applied to the ICCAT allocation. center column or any adjustments that we're going to applying that we've proposed in be the specifications, and I'll run down that column for We're looking at adding 202 metric tons back you. into the general category from the reserve, 21.4 into the harpoon category from the reserve, 59.4 to cover the overage in the angling category and then there is an additional 7.8 metric tons which is being added to the reserve which is the result of dead discards which were not harvested during 2004. So if you add up those three columns all the way you'll get the right hand column which is the proposed initial quarter for 2005, 908.3 for the general category, 90 for the harpoon, about 229 for the longline, 3.8 for the trap.

I want to make a note that in the handouts there was an error so this is the correct number on the screen, 530 for the Purse seine category, 288.6 for the angling category, 59.4 in the reserve and a total of 2109 for 2005. Several of these categories are further broken down into subcategories; the angling category is broken down into the school

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

category, the large school and small-medium category and the trophy category and then is further broken down based on the location of harvest.

So for the school category we've got a 117.2 total metric tons allocated in the '05 specs, broken down into the north, the south and the reserve for the large schools, small medium sized category 164.8 broken down by north and south, again, and in the trophy, 8.8 metric tons broken down by north and south again.

And one note on the angling category, ICCAT requires that we maintain a 4-year average of school bluefin landings below eight percent of the total landings for the United States. 2005 is the third year in that four-year average and as our landings have been slightly above that eight percent, so we're also asking for comments on how to reduce the catch of small bluefin tuna -- excuse me, school bluefin tuna for the 2005 and the 2006 years.

We're going to be talking on Tuesday evening specifically about the recreational fishery for 2005, so I'd ask you that you hold your comments on that until that discussion.

The other category that's broken down into sub-categories is the general category and the sub-

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

categories are based on time periods. The first subcategory is from June through the end of August that's allocated 60 percent of the overall quota and that would end up being 53 -- 539.04, 2005, the second time period is the month of September and that is 30 percent of the overall category and that's -of the overall quarter and that is 269.5 metric tons and the third sub period is October through the end of January, that gets 10 percent and that is 89.8 metric tons and then there is a 10 metric tons set aside for the New York pike. We've also proposed restricted fishing days for the general categories. The purpose of the restricted fishing days is to assist in extending the general category season and approve the distribution of fishing opportunities without increasing the overall mortality.

The RFDs that we have proposed in the specs include all holidays after November 18, which would be Thanksgiving, Christmas Eve and Christmas, New Year's Eve and New Year's Day. Also Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays after November 18th. The common period for the specs will be closing on April 18th, there are several ways that you can provide your comments in addition to verbalizing them today.

You can send them electronically to two

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

options, which would indicate on the screen and also on the handouts that you've received. You can snail mail them to me at this address or send them to our fax, that's all. And just to remind you that we've got several bluefin tuna items on the agenda for Wednesday, so if we can restrict our comments to just the bluefin specs right now, I think that would make our discussion most effective. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you, Dianne. I am sure everyone loves bluefin. Minutiae would always elect to participate in a separate working group if we establish one for bluefin, but it is rather complicated. I just want to make one note with respect to the slide Dianne showed on the general category sub periods. That is as we say hard coated in the plan, right now the fishery management plan contains the percentage allocations for each sub period.

And we understand that that is one of the items for discussion as we go through the planned consolidation and amendments. They are two and I know Louis Daniel had asked me this at the South Atlantic council meeting when we presented this at the scoping, I guess the post scoping, the pre-draft meeting as to why we were proposing this before

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

dealing with any amendments to it.

Well, we want to do is follow the process as it exists now and get the specs completed as early as possible this year and if there are any changes which ensue due to the discussions that we intend to have and the comment on the actual plan consolidation, we will make those accordingly in the final rule, so again the general categories subperiod as presented by Dianne reflects what is currently in the plan, not what we anticipate will be in the plan probably as soon as September or so this year or effective perhaps by December or so.

Again, trying to respond to the ongoing issues with the North Carolina petition for rulemaking we received several, several years back now on reallocation for -- to accommodate that -- that went to bluefin tuna fisheries zone. Again, this reflects what exists, not what will exist and we will have some further discussions as Dianne noted on bluefin tuna managements at several places throughout the meeting here.

But again if we can take comments right now on what is proposed with regard to the current constraints on bluefin tuna allocations. We had Joe McBride, I think Bob Fitzpatrick? No? Rich Ruais;

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Joe McBride, Rich Ruais.

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, Rich, thank you -- Chris rather, excuse me. Dianne, if you could be kind enough tomorrow at the after-hours forum on the angling category quota breakdown, you mentioned the North-South breakdowns in numbers, but if you could do it by state by state, north-south, particularly -- well, I'm only interested in north specifically. But it would be good if we knew what the landings were on each state according to your reckons. Is that a possibility for tomorrow night?

I don't want to belabor it now, you might not be prepared.

MS. STEPHAN: I don't know, but I will check with our recreational landings experts and see if they can do that for us.

MR. McBRIDE: All right, then we'll -- is that a yes, you have information, Chris, or you --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I believe to some extent for 2002 -- 2003 was addressed in the ad hoc committee report. We can bring some copies of that although you've already mailed one of those, if you didn't bring it with you. The 2004 information, I know we certainly have it, whether we can get it together in that forum for tomorrow night I'll have to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

see. We'll try.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

McBRIDE: Well, MR. okay, my an additional comment, if I may. To have an intelligent discussion of the distribution of this resource, north and south or however you want to divide it because you were mentioning the possibility of doing away with the north-south line. And in the years past, we've asked explicitly for a subcategory for the Block Island Sound, for lack of a better geographic term, area where we are cut out of the fish because of the environmental processes that go on, either early or during the season or later on in the season.

When we normally get our fish, there is nothing left for us to get. And this isn't the first year, it was the same problem last year, I don't want to belabor it now, we'll talk more tomorrow. But we really should see state by state to see what New York, to see what Connecticut and Rhode Island, what the landings are of bluefin in those three states. And to do a reasonable accurate survey of the landing, they all should be included, please.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Joe. Rich Ruais?

(tape interruption.)

MR. RUAIS: Well, what had changed was the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

deliberations of the ad hoc committee going through painstakingly the data and the methodology to revisit and revise 2002, 2003. So you could say that the framework was firmly established, well in place and it was just a matter of getting the contractor to commit that final installment of data in January and plug into that process.

There may be a few issues, so we're trying to reconvene the ad hoc committee to review what was done for 2004 to make sure it's as consistent as possible with the methodology that was finally settled on for 2002-2003. So again, it's just a matter of the framework being there, not disputed to all the relevant parties that participated in that process.

There may be a few changes based on the calculation of average weights. It's -- there was also some concerns that were addressed by the committee for 2002-2003. But we anticipate it's pretty close to what the final numbers would be.

(tape interruption.)

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, I think Louis Daniel is next. He'll comment on whether we were overly restrictive.

MR. DANIEL: Yes, you were, without question. Especially now that I see that there were

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

288 tons left when we closed on the 4th. That hurts.

But it don't hurt me, my pocketbook, like it does some of the folks around the table, but I won't, I'm not going to belabor that point right now.

I guess my main thing is that I too agree with Rich that, you know, I think it's great to get these out so early. I was real surprised to see it when I was called for the hearings and I was real pleased to see it. And my hope is that the consolidated HMS FMP, Jack and Chris and Margo, are -- is also one of the expected management actions in 2005.

I assume that it is from all the discussions that we've had in that North Carolina will have an opportunity and the South Atlantic states will have an opportunity to preplan this year before the December 1 sub-quota period begins, instead of waiting until the last minute, as we have the last several years.

I would just ask, plead, that if indeed the season up north is as it was last year, that some of the underages be put into reserve to give the folks better fishing off in North Carolina and in the South Atlantic, some cushion to have an opportunity to continue to fish later into the January sub-quota time period.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This year, when the fishery closed on the 4th of January, the next day a fish was landed in Hilton Head and one of our big goals in the South Atlantic has been to try to extend this fishery down into the South Atlantic region and give the states of South Carolina, Georgia and Florida some access to the general category fishery.

Also, as I'm sure you'll hear if you haven't already, we had a real -- we were very successful in promoting this fishery this year and having a lot of our brothers from the northern states come down to participate in the general category fishery. And I think they probably spent more money on hotel bills hanging around waiting for openings and closings than they actually made in the fishery this year. But everyone who participated was very pleased in the way that the fishery had -- operates off North Carolina.

And certainly had vessels from we Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, coming into North Carolina to take advantage of that fishery. So to be cognizant of that this year a little more than we were last year, understand the economic benefits of this, especially to the guys up north that have had such a dismal season, you know, I think we

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

can really allocate this general category sub-quota to
-- the real benefit to the general category permitholders, more so that we have in the past.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, Louis. Bob Fitzpatrick, and then Rom Whitaker.

MR. FITZPATRICK: The specifications look great. And I don't know if this is the right forum for this, but it's interesting that we can have a few years where we -- where the recreational fishery catches too much, yet we come back and we've got a big pile of fish.

The problem is that it's because there is no performance in the fishery in New England and if industrial-scale herring fishing continues inshore in the Gulf of Maine, this issue will snowball on you. The purse seine category won't perform, the general category won't perform and you will -- eventually, you're either going to have a hell of a winter in North Carolina or we're going to have so much quota piling up that we're not going to know what quite to do with it.

So I don't know if there is any room in there to start to look at that in this process, but it's a nightmare. We've got science, and as Chris, you were in Maine at the forum, we've got science and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

fishery observation that are dead against one other. Fishermen that say that there aren't any herring, that 60,000 is way too high, that it's been over-fished. A lot of people, Von Anthony (phonetic) included, I think, I think that it's already killed, that the interspawning component is wiped out.

And so I don't know if it comes under habitat, but year after year now we see a large body of bluefin show up in the Gulf of Maine and they leave because there is nothing for them to eat. Canadians are happy about it, that's it.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, thank you. For those who had the opportunity to be there that was a good informative session at the Maine Fishermen's Forum, looking at not only the herring distribution but also other factors that may lead to changes in bluefin tuna in the Gulf of Maine, exchange of water masses and sea surface temperature and salinity. But clearly the group in the room was pointing to the herring, interaction with the herring fisheries as the main determinant of bluefin tuna distribution in the Gulf of Maine. We will address that to the extent we can in this plan through the AFA designations, but again we will have to coordinate closely with the New England council on that matter.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And obviously, they will be following the herring assessments that they will receive from the Northeast Science Center.

I think we had Rom Whitaker and then Pete Manuel.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes, and I'm speaking from a charter boat operator who also participates in the general category fishery, but since I didn't get the 2004 and the initial Atlantic bluefin tuna quotas until March 7, 2005, I'm not sure what you did or how you did it. But you certainly took a step in the right direction in helping our industry. We'll be able to plan a little bit as to what's going to happen, and -- I mean, I could hardly believe it when they said the specs were already out.

And I'm not exactly sure how you ended up with the numbers but I will -- would like to see it. It looks real promising now, and I hope that it'll reflect what Louis said, if there is quota left available, we would certainly like to take advantage of it. And I also want to thank you for letting the angling continue till -- I think it just closed here in the last couple of weeks, but that's certainly very important too. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Rom. Well, give a plug then for Joe DiFossi (phonetic) for working on the angling category aspects for '04, and certainly Dianne Stephan, in pulling the '05 aspects together. Again this is in essence only part of the process, because we will be deliberating through the consolidation on ways to revitalize or revise the allocation decisions in in-season management. We'll get more into that, well, tomorrow night and then on Wednesday.

MR. MANUEL: A point that has been brought up a lot in the past over this fishery and Joe McBride, you know, brought it to light, the angling category fishery, the delays in getting the numbers till the end of the year, made it the question that he had to have to ask. The delay in angling numbers this year fortunately rolled over to 2005 283 tons from general category. Those 283 tons could have been harvested in January or in December, if we had had the data in a timely manner.

That's why I feel like it it's imperative that the angling category whether you stick with LPS until that's changed or whatever means of counting, that you get the numbers, you know, at least by bimonthly. That's a proper way to really manage your fishery in real-time data. And I think that he

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

brought a point out there, opened a lot of people's eyes, without the information you can't manage your fishery in real-time information. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thank you Pete. Any other questions or comments on the proposed 2005 bluefin tuna quota specifications? Well, at this point we do have some time and any members of the public that wanted to come in on any three of the presentations, both the ICCAT trade restrictive measures, the shark quotas, or the bluefin tuna proposed quotas. No public members. Well, we are well ahead on our agenda for today. I guess we were caught you off guard by having the tuna specs out months before you anticipated it.

But again, I do thank Joe and Dianne for pulling that together to try to give us a better chance of meeting your needs for early information about the proposed specifications.

SPEAKER: And Brad McHale too.

MCHale. I know he had to pull all those numbers together from the commercial monitoring system. What -- it is the pleasure of the Committee, I see Bob yawning there, Bob Pride, but that doesn't mean he's not interested in going on through 5:00 o'clock.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Randy Blankenship?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Since we've got this little bit of time here, we were having a question earlier about the hierarchy with the new international office and how that will fit into the structure of things for National Marine Fisheries. Is that part of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries? Is it is in line with that, is it off to the side? How does that work?

SPEAKER: No, I think that there's been a concern for a long time that since we broke up the old international office, we recognized a need to do coordination. We've been looking for lots of different ways of doing that and none of them worked satisfactorily. The international portfolio for this agency is huge and it makes sense to have a lot of things distributed and handled by people with particular sets of expertise either in a regional basis.

You know, the folks in Alaska really need to be handling the Bering Sea stuff with Russia, although frankly our office has helped coordinate that for a long time. On the one hand, they have people who are the experts, either in an office on in the region, do that, but on the other hand making sure that everybody is talking to each other. We know for example in some

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of the things that you are interested in, you know, we send four or five different sets people to four or five different meetings, but the people that they are dealing with, and these are the countries, are all going to these meetings together.

And they have established relationships and they know how to deal with each other and we always felt that to some extent we weren't making a strong presentation on behalf of the United States as we would like to be able to, simply because we didn't have enough follow-through and coordination.

So ultimately Bill came to the conclusion that the only way to do that was to reestablish the Office of International Fisheries, which he did. Actually he reestablished it last year and about a month ago Jean-Pierre Ple came over from the State Department to be the director of that office.

So what they have done in a formal sense, I mean, Dean Swanson's budget is still in my budget. I make sure he is aware of that all the time but, informally now, in any formal reporting sense, Dean's division, which has handled ICCAT and a lot of other things, is part of the new office. One position from the Science and Technology Office, I think two positions from Protected Resources, folks who dealt

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

really in international issues have also migrated to that office. So they're beginning to build up and that's where Chris will end up working out of when he transitions into this new role.

They're separate from us, they -- Jean-Pierre reports to Rebecca though, so Rebecca is still really the person who continues to be in charge. And I think he'll end up, you know, making this better. I was not a believer of this when I first came back to the Agency three years ago, but after watching our performance I really think that this is going to be the right move. Jaime?

MR. ALVARADO-BREMER: I'm glad you said that, the way that you said that because one criticism of the old international is that not having those experts focused and concentrating on, you know, areas of expertise. When it gets, you know, too many jobs around those 60 or so international forums that we're involved in, it becomes less effective. I'm real glad you spoke the way you did on this focus.

SPEAKER: I'm a little confused by all the lateral movements and everything. Jean-Pierre Ple is still with the State Department, he's just in a slightly different role, is that right?

SPEAKER: No, Jean-Pierre now works for

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Rebecca, he is the office director for International Fisheries and NOAA Fisheries.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, well, we're not used to having free time at the advisor panel meetings. So I was going to suggest we take one item off the agenda for tomorrow and knock that off. Ken, you had a question or comment?

MR. HINMAN: Well, I did not know if you were going to do this at the end of the meeting or not, but can you sketch out the timeline for the Amendment 2, now that you've done the pre-draft and the comment period ends the end of the month? When we might expect the draft and when we might expect public hearings?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, generally speaking we intended to regroup after the AP. We really need see how much progress we've made on identifying preferred alternatives and getting feedback on the level of analysis that will be required. But to nail down a firm timeline that we'd report back to Jack and Bill and Rebecca, well, generally speaking we would be working on the formal draft document, a draft environmental impact statement and the proposed rule and try to get them out in maybe a June time frame, so that we would have

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

opportunity for discussion over the course of this summer for the open public comment periods.

Since it is a formal environmental impact statement and a formal proposed rule, we want to have official comment periods open as long as the possible, 60 days. So that would give us July and August for the formal comment period and enough time schedule another advisory panel Typically, what we've done in the past is to schedule the advisory panel toward the end of the official comment period, that way we have the benefit of summarized comments for the advisory panel, but are still in that open comment period for members of the public who want to comment, maybe make a final presentation at the advisory panel meeting.

So that would put us in early fall as the point where we would be generating the final documents during the response to comments. Normally, when we issue a final rule we who would have 30-days delayed effectiveness. So again, shooting for a November time frame for final documents with delayed effectiveness put us in a December time frame. Certainly, that's the time frame that we think would work to accommodate public comment. We may be talking to Jack about additional resources to keep us

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

on that time line.

But it certainly would make sense also -one of the issues that we're discussing in this
document would be the change from a current fishing
year back to a calendar year. And it would make
sense to make that change on January 1, so certainly
we would want to be effective in order to do that.

So that's the general time frame and, you know, we'll certainly be keeping folks apprised as we issue each document, each milestone, each step of the way. And certainly we'll be in contact with the advisory panel once the draft documents get out so that we can schedule an advisory panel meeting.

Any other comments or concerns on the time line? Well, seeing as we've done well on our time line for today I thought one possibly -- okay. All right, well, it's 4:15. I think we could probably knock off what had been scheduled for 11:30 tomorrow, northern albacore tuna, pretty quickly. And then Louis Daniel has some information he can present.

Rebuilding plan for northern albacore, it was designated as overfished based on an ICCAT stock assessment in October of 1999 report to Congress.

Under the Magnuson Act, if a species is designated as overfished, you have one year to implement a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

rebuilding plan. That rebuilding plan has certain parameters but in the unique case of internationally managed fisheries, the Magnuson Act does allow for an internationally negotiated rebuilding plan.

That's what we had done in the FMP for Atlantic bluefin tuna and for North Atlantic swordfish. That FMP came in the Summer of 1999, and therefore didn't have the benefit of that stock assessment information. So we've been in a situation where we've designated northern albacore overfished, but have not implemented through a plan amendment a formal rebuilding plan.

Again, it was our intent to implement a rebuilding plan similar to that which had been done in the plan for bigeye tuna. In other words, we had information from ICCAT for rebuilding plans for bluefin tuna and for North Atlantic swordfish. And we -- what we did with bigeye was to establish the foundation within the plan to ahead and negotiate a rebuilding plan at ICCAT with timetables and targets and things like that consistent with the Magnuson Act. But we have not had the opportunity to do so for northern albacore until this juncture because the plan was opened so to speak for new items to be added to it.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

What is the current status of northern albacore? At the 2000 meeting, ICCAT for the first time recommended a hard tack with country quotas. 34,500 metric tones was recommended. That is a replacement yield level according to the current stock assessment. In other words, even though the stock was considered slightly overfished, at least at this initial phase, it was stabilized so to speak at a replacement yield level.

The United States received a quota of 607 metric tons of that allocation, a very percentage. In the subsequent ICCAT meetings we have tried to address that, requesting some more flexibility on that 607 metric tons, because our fishery is highly variable. When albacore are running close to the shore not only are they picked up in some of the commercial fisheries, but in the recreational fishery as well. And we were concerned that on average we may exceed that 607 as well as be below it.

We have been below it by factors of 100 to 150, 200 metric tons in the intervening years, so we certainly haven't exceeded 607 metric tons. And in fact have been able to carry forward some of the underharvested amounts. SCRS attempted to revise the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

assessment in 2004, but could not do so, particularly because of some concerns about the catch-at-age information from some of the major harvesting nations.

It hadn't been appropriately validated, conversion of fish lengths to ages, and therefore did not do an age-structured assessment. In a 2003 meeting it had been -- the tack had been extended again to -- by 34,500 metric ton, again a replacement yield that came out of the 2000 assessment.

So the next assessment is actually scheduled for 2007; it is a question as to whether the assessment will change markedly from that which was done in 2000. I guess you could say the saving grace, if anything, for northern albacore has been that the catches had been well below the tack. Particularly the European community, we have asked them what was the problem with respect to not meeting their catch quotas.

At first the answer was banning drift nets in the Bay of Biscay and converting those fishermen to trawling, and they were not effective at it, at least initially. Most recently they stated that the albacore, in a similar situation that we face, were well offshore and not accessible to the trawl fleet.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

But clearly they have been only harvesting amounts, around 20,000 metric ton level even though their quota has been about 28,000.

So it remains to be seen exactly what the next assessment in 2007 will show, whether the low catches are assigned as the stock is continuing to decline or if it truly wasn't the availability issue to the fleet. One could assume that the low level of harvest relative to replacement yield might indicate that the stock has been might even say fully rebuilt by the time they get that assessment done.

So what does that mean for us? We had put a -- in a preamble to a proposed rule back in 2000, the issue of what should be our strategy for rebuilding northern albacore. We included several alternatives, no action, a 10-year rebuilding program executed on a unilateral basis and similar to what we had done for bigeye and bluefin and North Atlantic swordfish, establishing the foundation within the plan for an international rebuilding program that would be negotiated through ICCAT.

Again, since we didn't open the plan up for amendment at that time we hadn't included that in the plan, but we did get favorable public comment at the time that establishing the foundation for an

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

international rebuilding program would be the appropriate approach for northern albacore. Also got some comment that whatever we negotiated, ICCAT should include some flexibility for the U.S. fleet regarding its access or availability to northern albacore resource as being somewhat subject to variation from year to year.

So at this juncture, we're basically putting out the same alternatives for additional public comment and would include a preferred alternative in the draft plan. And certainly will include the final plan or final rebuilding plan in the consolidated FMP. I think that was their last line. Joe McBride and then Nelson Beideman, northern albacore.

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, thank you, Chris. The northern albacore is a very, very important fishery in our region, offshore the months of August and September. It's turned out to be what the great demise of the yellowfin, the major tuna we're catching. You used the term or acquiesced to 607 metric tons based on recent average U.S. catches. What's the determination of -- what is the deciding factor? How did you come up with that figure? Or how did you acquiesce to that figure?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, that first occurred at the 2000 meeting, which was in Morocco. And that was based, I believe, at that time on the past five years of catches that the U.S. had reported to SCRS. So that it was a five year average at that time.

MR. McBRIDE: Yeah, and now --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Since then it has been consistently below 607 by -- again, in the order of 100 metric tons or so.

MR. McBRIDE: Well, you know, at one time, I don't know what goes on now with variations in the fisheries, but at one time there wasn't much, and this -- at least in my geographic area, of a commercial fishery. This was probably almost a recreational fishery, there was no money on longfin tuna, yellowfin far exceeded it in value, so if you brought it in, if they gave you anything, they gave you almost nothing.

Well, they told you they didn't want them when they came in, so they stay with the recreational community, but they are very important to us in the recreational community. And I wouldn't want to see us giving it away and I don't still know how your landings, were your landing commercial landings, you

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the

report to SCRS, so what was decided recreational --MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Both commercial and recreational. MR. McBRIDE: Well, what was recreational basis? BPRs (phonetic) in those days or MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, that would be primarily MERFs. MR. McBRIDE: Primarily MERFs? MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: To some 10 extent they yellow -- albacore are captured in the 11 Large Pelagic Survey as well, but between the two of 12 them --13 MR. McBRIDE: 14 15 16 17

Well, I mean, why wouldn't they be in the Large Pelagic Survey, as a general rule which is, bad as it is, it is probably better than MERFs. You know, what I am really saying is I don't think these are accurate figures. I don't think this is a right percentage of the pie for the United States and I -- you know, I certainly wasn't there, so I don't know. But 607 metric tons is a small proportion for the United States catch, but even now, as you say, the landings right now don't come up to 607 metric tons, is that correct?

> MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: That's

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

correct. I think in the last three or four years we reported in from about 450 to 550 or so.

MR. McBRIDE: All right. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Joe. Rom Whitaker? Nelson, and then Rom Whitaker.

MR. BEIDEMAN: What kind of scientific support do we put into the albacore stock assessment? Because I just think something is funky with the science on albacore. Each of these critters that we deal with is a little bit different. But, you know, adult albacore is what our fisheries catch, you know, both recreational and commercial. And those adults are spread out everywhere. Everywhere you go, if you fish deep enough you will get some albacore.

And the Japanese, you know, proved this in, you know, the area fishing that they do, you will catch some albacore. And they will gather, they will congregate, but they congregate a little bit differently than some of the other species we're used to. And I just think that, you know, as yet we don't have a full handle on the science and that in the long term the U.S. needs to, you know, look into what scientific support we are putting in there, so that we can learn.

Because something is funky about, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

albacore being so much further down than some of these other species that do congregate more and do have a lot more fishing effort on them continuously.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, certainly the U.S. scientists participate in the assessments and they bring the data available from the U.S. catches. Obviously, it's highly depended on the EC since they are the main harvester of albacore with -- I guess close to 90 percent of the tack was allocated to the -- maybe 85-90 percent of the tack allocated to the EC. So obviously most of the catch statistics are going to have to be supplied by the And particularly the catch-at-age information EC. was what was lacking last time around for the assessment. Rom Whitaker?

MR. ROM: Yes. We don't catch northern albacore in my area, but what concerns me is what Joe said is about the, you know, all of a sudden we're assigned to count our tunas and we're going to probably be dealing with yellowfin tunas here very soon. And that's going to be even worse, but here the United States is assigned -- we're taking a number from a survey that has proved be very inaccurate and years past.

And all of a sudden we have got a hardline

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

quota to follow and I feel like that when our counting methods come up to par a little better, that all of a sudden we are going to be looking at one fish a day or one per boat or something to that effect. And the same thing happened with marlins, you know. So I think that sometimes we have to base our quota on something other than MERF survey, I don't know. We have got to do a better job, but I think it may be understated. Thank you.

 $\label{eq:Moderator} \mbox{MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:} \quad \mbox{Thank you,} \\ \mbox{Rom. Dick Stone?}$

MR. STONE: Yeah, just to really follow up on what Rom and Joe both said. It's -- Andy Loftus and I, as you know, looked at yellowfin and albacore a few years back. And it was very clear that there was a very large underestimate possible for both of the species. And we strongly suggest that looking at logbooks for charter boats and party boats are the way to go in getting data.

I think, as Rom pointed out, I mean we could get ourselves in a serious trouble in the future. And in fact, we have gotten ourselves into trouble already because we haven't had good recreational data and I think you would have seen -- not that makes necessarily that big a difference

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

let's say for northern albacore, but for so many other species that could. But even for northern albacore why not have a census where you have an opportunity to have that, versus a sample, which is subject to many biases.

So again you will hear me get on my soapbox again about trying to use logbook data for charter and party boats. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you, Dick. Joe McBride and then John Graves.

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, to go along with what Dick is saying I think that is extremely important. With all the mechanisms that we have, MERFs, the other dockside surveys, whether it be highly migratory or what have you, we now have a licensing system for the highly migratory species, shark, what have you. The only ones that have VTR reports are those I think, if I'm correct -- if I'm not correct, please correct me, are those in the -- under the jurisdiction of the New England Council that have ground-fish permits et cetera.

Well -- and not to put a burden on anybody else, but for accuracy, drop some of the other garbage, and clean the MERF survey, as for as I am concerned or let the states take it over it if there

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

is a need for it. Utilize your resources for the VTRs and try to get a professional and accurate report on what goes on in our industry which has -- and I agree 100 percent with Rom and what Dick said, unless we get accurate figures we are out of business.

I mean many of us, including myself in New York, are pushing for a state license, not because we want to pay more taxes because we want an accountable universe. And statistically, till we do that we are going to be the garbage pile of the statistics of the National Marine Fisheries Service. But you can do a good job of getting accurate information because of the system with the VTRs, if not, at least for those who are licensed for the HMS species.

And that gives you your tuna, sharks, et al, because no one is supposed to be fishing for them now, not only the charter and party boats, but everybody who is fishing for them should fill them out on a daily basis to get us some facts. It doesn't cost you any more than it costs you now. And then of course use them once you get them. There is nothing worse than putting those for the time and effort of filling them out and finding out that there is very little very use of the VTRs because of their

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

regionalization.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks, Joe. John Graves and Bob Zales and Bobbi Walker.

MR. GRAVES: Thank you, Chris. Just -- I am going to take the ICCAT perspective here, and once again, the base group of the Advisory Committee has long time pushed to get better data for the base group. But we have come to a hard number now with albacore and we are always afraid that's going to happen with the yellowfin. The advantage we have here is we don't have another assessment until 2007, so that gives us a horizon on which we could try and do some retrospective analyses, go through the SCRS process and change our historical catch information, if we have data to support that.

So that may be something that's doable and as you are looking at directing resources that may be an area you want to go. In terms of the alternatives that have been listed, I think from my perspective, and I think I probably reflect the Committee at large, is to do nothing. We have a credibility issue at ICCAT, we are less than 2 percent of the reported catch for northern albacore. And if we come up with anything, the EC, who has 90 percent of the quota is going to say, stop it.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

You know, this our resource, so don't tell us how to manage this. So I mean the best we can do is to try to work with them and to keep the flexibility for our fishery, realizing that it is seasonal depending on catches, depending on oceanographic conditions.

And I'd also probably -- I'll also want to point out that the reason that we are 100 to 200 metric tons below or 607, is probably because we have a much reduced longline effort. And so that contribution has been reduced, and if that comes back up then we are going to be pushing the limits. So there is a need for us to try and increase our numbers to actually show what our historical catch has been.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, John. We have Bob Zales and Bobbi Walker.

MR. ZALES: You know, I'm going to get on my soapbox a little bit too. HMS, you all have, in my mind, in a lot of our minds I guess, you are in a unique position because basically you all have permitted everybody that legally fishes for HMS, whether it is private recs all the way to commercial. And so you have something that really nobody else in fisheries that I know of has. You have a database;

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

you have the ability to sample everybody that's out there.

And you know, while I have been a big complainer about the recreational data system in this country, I think I have also contributed quite a bit to try to improve it. And I will be the first to step out there and say that the for-hire survey has made some dramatic improvements. But it is still lacking and I'm going to give you an example, weather is a critical factor.

And this is the reason why we've advocated logbooks for the past couple of years, I guess, for the for-hire industry and party boats and the for-hire industry in general and at some point probably getting into the purely private rec to do something similar. Because last, wave 5 (phonetic) September and October of '04, Hurricane Ivan devastated the coast of Alabama. It pretty well devastated Pensacola, Florida to Gulf Shores. And for those of you who haven't seen the area, when you see pictures of the tsunami that happened a few months ago that is basically what it looked like when it happened. It's pretty well torn up.

The state, for several weeks after the storm, shut down the waterways. You couldn't get on

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the water without getting a ticket. But you had the red snapper harvest in wave 5 off of Alabama, it was 50 percent higher than wave 5 of '03. It was impossible to do. A logbook would have shown it. And so you need to do something to improve this data because you hear every time, every meeting that I'm ever at, data is a problem.

And you all have -- you are in a good position. You can take the data you get and make it a whole lot better.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, Bob. Bobbi Walker and Jim Donofrio.

MS. WALKER: I am going to follow on with that, Chris. MERF uses random coastal phone calls in order to establish effort. You have something very unique, as Bob said, you have the universe identified with HMS permits. At the very least, you could drastically reduce some of the errors by just calling those people with permits. Because if you remember, I don't know how LPS works, but I know that MERF on random or on rare-event species, it doesn't work, and they will tell you that. So you need to talk with MERF and see if they can -- since the universe is identified, if they can't just call those people rather than just coastal.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Yes, that's what we do with the Large Pelagic Survey and on even under MERFs for the for-hire sector, they use the permit frames now, to have targeted telephone calls. The issue for a large pelagic survey though is that we only dial from Virginia through Maine. So we are dependent on MERFs for the private sector catches of yellowfin or albacore that might occur in the South Atlantic and the Gulf. So we have been in discussions with our Office of Science and Technology on how to expand the LPS style survey into the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico, which would be a sample frame survey.

MS. WALKER: Well, I know in the Gulf it would be a rare-event species. But I am sure there are some caught somewhere, but what's the difference between LPS and MERF, the estimates? Was it a WAD (phonetic)?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, it can be quite variable from year to year on MERFs, because as you say, it is a rare-event species and what tends to happen is you get a few dark-side intercepts with the so called rare event and it does expand or extrapolate through the population of the coastal county because of the random digit dialing. And that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is precisely why we have the LPS as a specialized survey, looking only at the permit-holders and only doing the dark-side intercepts at targeted mariners, likely to be more representative of offshore large pelagic fishing.

But they do fluctuate. I know that Dick and Andy when they looked at it, there were some instances where the MERFs was over LPS and some instances where LPS was over MERFs. So it really comes down to a question of variability and precision within each survey, which one is -- well, they are both surveys. And therefore, they are both subject to imprecisions. You can't really establish one as the base line.

You have two numbers, one is higher than the other, you can't say that one is overestimating with respect to the other because you don't know the true number in either case. One may be biased high, one may be biased low, relative to the true number, or they both may be biased high, just one more than the other, so --

MS. WALKER: If I might just interject just one more point. And I apologize for taking so much time, but I know in the Northern Gulf, one of the things that we have identified is that the boats come

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

in late at night or they leave late at night when they are going on tuna trips. So they are never intercepted by MERF because of just the time that they leave and return to the dock.

So that's something that is going to need to be worked out so that we start picking up these yellowfin harvests that have been going on in the Gulf historically, but it looks like we never catch them.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks. We have James Donofrio and then Joe McBride.

MR. DONOFRIO: Chris, thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: How about Jim, Dick and Joe?

MR. DONOFRIO: Thank you, Chris. I concur with John Grays that there may be some opportunity here. And the way I see the opportunity is what we discussed at the I-CAD meeting last week. I'm convinced that we have to explore catch cards, because we already have an existing license as people here have emphasized today. We have an -- and I'm not a proponent of a saltwater license, I can tell you, but we already have it. Right now what it amounts to is a tax, we have a tax with no benefit to the recreational community.

So since the National Fishery Service has

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

this tax on us, give us a catch card and I brought samples that I'll print over tonight and send around tomorrow to the committee from Washington State. Just take the names off here, it says sturgeon, steelhead, salmon, (inaudible). Interject the names of those other species that we fish for, we the limited bag limits we have, it has month and day. exactly the time that you land that fish on your boat, you are supposed to take a pen because I fished in Washington with my guests out there, and what you do is, you just, okay, you put your month and date, one Steelhead, whatever. When you -- if you get boarded your catch better match your catch card. you are going to probably get your compliance up to about 99 percent, because no one wants them come in and have fish on the boat that don't match the catch card.

You know it is real simple, and so there's no lack of desire Chris from the recreational community who want to move forward here with good data, because to good data, and listen, we are going to live with it. I mean it make show we have less catch, more catch, whatever it is. We want a transparent system that we can believe in and then we go forward and we'll make the adjustments that ICCAT.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But we have a strong desire to do this rapidly and the consensus at ICCAT is from our committees that we want to do that. I just like to hear from all the other members of this panel to move forward and explore this and the way you could make it more accurate is, you could -- once you get your catch card you make it mandatory also to call-in, so it matches, okay.

And then at the end of the year in order to get another permit as they do in Washington state, you have to submit this like I have my license now, I got a notice from them that I didn't submit my information and I didn't know as a non-resident. Now I have to dig up my permit, send it in and even if you don't catch, it says, you know, they want to know because they'll do CPUE. So it's a real accurate system, we want to move forward, and you know, I'm asking you to -- let's explore this, thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you Jim, we'll extradite you to Washington State if we have to make sure you complete that -- the catch card. Dick Stone and Joe McBride, please.

MR. STONE: Just a quick follow up. When we looked at the Gulf of Mexico, where it's particularly bad in terms of -- there are some zero

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

catches in some years down there when there were thousands of fish caught, you know, by the charter fleet, and the head boat fleet down there. One of the problems even with the new for hire survey, and we looked at the new for hire survey, which supposed called the captain. So, I mean, its not like we haven't looked at that survey as well. And the reason we have no confidence in that, in some areas particularly, is simply because of this. Because there is indications of no catch when there were thousands of fish caught. And one of the reasons, in the Gulf of Mexico particularly, they may include the guide boats.

You know, so when you actually call people, your sample of vessels that you call, you may not get the people that really fished off shore. So why use a system that has these biases when you can have a census. I just continue to promote that. The ACCSP, which is working hard to try to get better data from both the commercial and recreational sides supports log books, looking at log books, with quality control so that you can check these things out and obviously observer coverage, can be one of the things that's used. So, anyhow I just.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thanks

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Dick. Joe McBride.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, thank you, Chris. To go along with what both Jim and Dick said. First of all going back to what Jim's point about the licensing. I heard the good news this year, and in addition to what is it, \$27 for the HMS license, is the fees still the same for the 2005 season. We have an internal catch of mahi mahi and sometimes wahu. That's another \$70 I have to now apply to the south east senate to get a permit for that, which I am trying to figure out which year I started my cooperation and probably be in jail by the time the next meeting comes about but, you know, we have a license and the difference between MERFs, which is voluntary for the most part because of someone rejects the MERF survey, they just wont get the heck off the deck at least in Montauk. And they have no respect for them.

I don't mean the survey, as an individual as I am talking about the procedure and secondly for higher survey I must be the only one in it. Because I get called every week for that one. I just called them the other day, I said, I just told you a week ago I am not fishing till May 1. Please don't call me every week and have me send this thing in and so

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

forth, and that, I am saying this facetiously of course, but there is something wrong with a survey like that, which is also a voluntary survey. And I'm the first one to push in support of the service here to do the survey work.

But you try telling that to guys who see these things, you know, year after year is just taking their time. The VTRs or some other similar form, I don't care what format it takes, is a mandated, enforceable survey. Those in it take a risk every time they violate it. And if they get caught violating it, they will get punished one way or the other. It is the only survey that has any real threat behind it and I to this day do not know why you don't utilize it more. I have my suspicions, but that's something else. Well, thank you, but you really should utilize the tool that you have to do acute reporting on the fisheries.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Richard Ruais. Thanks Rich, Robert Pride.

MR. PRIDE: Thank you Chris. You know, I guess I have to add my two sentences to the comments around the table about a census. We met in New Orleans in 1996 and had this discussion the first time that I had participated fully, and yet the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

services, you know, years later are still talking about doing something different. And about the only thing that is going on different is we are having the NRC take a second look at the process. After they already looked at it in 2000, so, I mean, let's encourage the service through whatever means that you guys have at your disposal to get off -- get off its duff and get this done. Let's get the census process in place. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, just for the record, we do have a mandatory census program in effect, in two states it involves a catch card, Maryland and North Carolina. In the other states it involves either a web based report or a touch-tone toll free telephone call. And if you had a chance to review the Ad Hoc committee report, you could see that the compliance rate with respect to the web or telephone reporting are pretty dismal. At least as we can measure them. And that's -- in the order of anywhere from 15 or 0 in some states to 15 or 25 percent.

So the -- that system is predicated on the permit, but obviously we don't have the buy in from the ranking file recreational community whether it's the for higher sector or the private boat sector, we

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

have made some target enforcement efforts and that has resulted in, I guess, you could say temporary upward adjustments in the participation rate, but it hasn't been long lasting and the question is, what do we do now. We have engaged certain states in the partnership with respect to the catch cards and that's a much more effective approach. I understand what Jim Donofrio presented as an alternative, and do tie that to permit renewals.

So, either a negative report or some positive report need to come in, or you would precluded from renewing the permit. Certainly these are approaches that can be taken, we'll have to take them under advisement given the amount of money we have to spend on implementing them, and you certainly mailing out catch cards to 10, 15, 20,000 anglers, its going to -- its going to take some resources to monitor a program like that and make sure that the cards are coming back in. But its durable, it works in Washington state, it works in other states with catch card programs and we will have to take a look at how we can implement it, how much it will cost and how quickly we can get them on line.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Maryland on those catch card programs, they are predicated on us providing some funds, but the state provided the personal in order to get it done. You had a follow-up coming Bob.

MR. PRIDE: Just that, you know, you covered in your comments when you said that there needs to be some mechanism for making sure people comply and I think this renewal or non renewal of the permit is about the only stick that we've got -- that we can all point out and say that, it would work, thank you,

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Jim Donofrio or Rick Weber. And then Bob Zales.

MR. DONOFRIO: Chris, thanks. You know, regarding the, you know, the cost of this, I will never say I speak for the entire sport fishing industry, but I can tell, I talk to a lot of people including Rick's dad and others who are involved in this sport fishing industry, whether you have a 25 foot or 24 foot center console or you own a 50 foot hatter or something like that, it doesn't matter. You've got a lot of money invested in sport fishing. Just a spool of line today is ridiculous. I mean, if you had it up to \$50 a year, and make it accurate, its no big deal. You know, to get -- to get the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

catch card going. So the problem is nobody wants to spend \$27 on a tax that they get nothing from. That's the big beef, and I think that's why you don't have the compliance. I suspect there is probably another forty or fifty thousand boats there that -that are probably fishing illegally, I mean, my god, look at how many boats there are from Florida up to the Gulf of Maine, and only 22,000 permits are out there, it doesn't make any sense. They are not getting anything from it. You show them -- you demonstrate to the recreational community, you are going to get something for this permanent. I bet you'll see more compliance, even more people signing up for it, so you get the data.

 $\label{eq:Moderator} \mbox{MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks Jim.} \\ \mbox{Rick Weber and Bob Zales.}$

MR. WEBER: Just along the same lines where Jim was going, I heard Bob say it's the only stick we've got. I'd like to look for a cared idea and, you know, not that you guys need to be the ones coordinating this, but before you put something like a mandatory log through on the racks. Let us try to make it recreational rather than feeling like a new onerous reporting requirement. Let us work within the industry and see if we can get a sponsor, a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

price, an event, a drawing or something, someway to celebrate or recognize those people that are actively turning in their cards, let us partner with you and try to make it -- lets bring it through as a positive thing, that was all just a different idea of getting more compliance.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks Rick,
Bob Zales, and then we'll let Russ go, and then Jack
Devnew. Welcome Jack, I failed to recognize you when
you came in.

MR. ZALES: The one point that you had about the enforcement problem with the call in and I brought this to your attention, it may have been at a meeting or back something, I think Russell Dunn was there. Back this summer, I had a call from a charter captain who caught a swordfish. He had all the permits and I haven't looked at my permits, so I can't be sure, you can correct me if I'm wrong. But I don't believe the call in number is on the permit that we get. He didn't know who to call, did know how to find the number. So he tracked me down three days later and I gave him the information.

So that's part of the problem, I think that it's not so much that people are not wanting to do something, it is that they are not going to go crazy

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

looking for something. It should be provided fairly easy for them to get. And in my travels across the country as president of NACO. Every place I go, whether it is for hire or whether it is a purely private rig person, probably, I must say a 100 percent of them, because I really haven't had any of them tell me they don't want good numbers. They all tell me they want to better with it.

They don't like the numbers that are there, because nobody believes them. They want to do something, why can't I give you numbers, I always -how can we give -- tell people how we fish, what we do, who can we give that information to and when you try to explain to them the randomness and all the stuff that goes along with trying to collect data in a statistical formula, they don't understand that. So like Dick said there is a way that you can get the private sector involved in this. They are begging to give information to you. For some reason or the other nobody seems willing to try to get it. So, you know, that's why we have encouraged and pushed and tried to be active in this thing to try to figure out a better way and get many minds involved and try to have somebody bring the answer to you'll that you will listen to.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But many times it just seems like all this information has fallen on deaf ears, and nobody wants to work with it, because you hear this complaint like I said earlier, everywhere you go this is the number one complaint that you hear in fisheries management.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay, thanks
Bob. Russ you had a point on the marlin colin,
(phonetic) swordfish colin?

MR. DUNN: Well, it's on marlin-specific or -- not only marlin but also just the reporting issue generally. Now, I don't -- I am not questioning anyone's sincerity here in terms of the desire for But there is a massive disparity in better data. what we are hearing around the table here and what the reality is in terms of actions to help purport fish. Last year, in 2004, we had swordfish reported from Florida, Massachusetts and Alabama. So there were no fish called in from anywhere else. We had shellfish called in from only the state of Florida and we had blue marlin called in from only New Jersey and Puerto Rico -- for which species, blue marlin, New Jersey and Puerto Rico. And so while everyone sits here and says, oh we want better data and we all need it, we all agree the data is not great. having a tough time believing that people are going

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to go and fill out catch cards, I like Jimmy's idea,
I think its great if people could -- and I think
there is an enforcement hook there, because like you
said, the guy comes on the boat and what not.

But I'm skeptical that if no one will pick up the phone and make a phone call, that they are going to fill out the card and mail that in. And its just there's a huge disparity between what we're seeing here -- hearing here and what we're seeing on the ground. That's my point.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: But they were no longer talking about -- Yes, Jack has an observation that we were talking about, northern albacore and now we're into recreational data collections. It's certainly --

(Laughter)

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Certainly much broader. I believe we concluded our discussion on northern albacore for the most part anyway. But Jack Devnew was next on the list and then we'll go for shore hands after Jack.

JACK DEVNEW: Thanks, Chris. Sorry, I was late too. Anyway, I certainly am very supportive and applaud the efforts that I've heard about data collection hear around the table. So -- very welcome

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

news. And supportive of the move from survey to census. However couple of comments just recently here between Jimmy and Rick made me pause for some concern there. You know, if we have a huge reporting problem here, in terms of willingness, first off, Jim, I think you're going to need to move past the \$27 and get nothing for it, because we've been used to that for a very long time. And now in the commercial fishery, I think that's just the nature of beast you pay your money and you get your license and your go fish into the best of your, you know, things. But I don't think you should expect something in particular in return.

particular in return.

It's not like it's going to be, you know,
earmarked money for recreational data collection or

earmarked money for recreational data collection or something. I think that goes into the great morass that is up here. But -- and then to Rick's point, and -- if we're going to move from a survey to a census, which is great, the problem with it is if you have 40,000 to 50,000 boats, and you're getting such a lack of reporting, how can you call it a census. Where do you -- how do you -- it's either a census, and everybody's got to do it? You know, you can't have rewards for people to do it. They got to do it or not. Otherwise it's not a census. And to have it

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

represented, be represented as such would be erroneous.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, I think we had a number of folks who wanted to respond on this point. Let me go for some folks, who haven't had a chance yet. Rick Weber, yes.

MR. WEBER: Jack, there was nothing in my statement that I meant to say that it was voluntary. It was totally mandatory. I was simply saying it's a presentation issue to the public at large of whether they're looking at it as a negative or a neutral. I don't think there -- I don't -- I don't necessarily agree with Bob that everyone's rushing to give it. If we tell them it must be done, there is an opportunity just to make it not seem as bad by saying, "Hey" when you do, we'll find sponsors or do something just to make it a little less onerous in appearance, but totally mandatory. I'm with you on that. Can't be voluntary.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, we've had a number of folks who wanted to speak, we have filled the void so to speak. It's 5:00 o'clock. We were going to try to deal with some information from Louis Daniel, but the time has escaped us. We can go on for another few minutes, but I expect that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

folks who have traveled today are probably tired and want to get on. We will have an opportunity to discuss this with bluefin management tomorrow evening. But obviously information to data collection on recreational fisheries is broader than just bluefin. So I think Pete Manuel and then Bob Fitzpatrick. And then we'll call it an evening.

MR. MANUEL: He gets penalized when he breaks the law. If you're going to -- if the recreational community is going -- total community across the board, if one sector is blistered financially when they blatantly break the law, then the other sector should be. And if we're going to -- the bottom line is we're looking for the future for our children or grand kids, what they can catch by managing the fisheries. And one sector should not be held in any different standards than the other. If the recreational community breaks the law, then they should get a heavy nova (phonetic). Just like the commercial. That's all I want to say.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Jim Donofrio and Bob Fitzpatrick.

MR. DONOFRIO: Chris, thanks. This is in response to Russell and also to Jack. First of all, you know, it's not for me to get over it because I'm

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

overwritten. I can tell you right now if you go on websites, if you talk to guys on the dock, whatever, look at them at night, there is a tea party mentality in some of the community, sport fishing community. It's a tea party. To them it's like taxation without representation. That's how they feel on this whole HMS permit thing. I mean, I'm just amazed that there are so many boats from Florida to Gulf of Maine, I'll make that point again, and only 22,000 people are fishing for HMS species.

I find that very hard to believe. Give these guys something; give them some confidence Ross, that's what it comes down to. Show them you're going to have something that they have confidence in. And next thing you know, they're going to buy into it. They're not going to buy into a system they don't believe in. And Geoffrey Dodsky's (phonetic) here. He can tell you. He's going to need about 18,000 agents then in order to enforce it. Just give them something; they'll comply if they have something they believe in.

You don't have enough enforcement right now. You can never ever enforce the law the way it is. But give them some neck and believe in. That's the conversation we had down in ICCAT with the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

admiral.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think Jack and all, if you were sitting were Bill would, we just told the admiral the same thing. Give us something we can believe in. You'll see these guys complying. That's what it comes down to.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thanks
Jimmy, Bob Fitzpatrick.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Coming from the commercial sector, I'm kind of missing something I look at recreational hunters all over the United States. And there are many, many, many, many, many tens of thousands of them who are burdened to use the word that's used frequently with reporting You tag your deer-- you get your requirements. hunting license, you tag your deer, you follow the system. If you don't and you get caught with a deer without a tag that's jacking deer. And you're not hunting, in that state for a long time. If fact, you might have to pay a big fine, they may take your weapons. How about if they take somebody's boat, if they get caught with an untagged fish.

I think I -- Massachusetts and the recreational lobster fishery has that card and annually, being a diver, who used to catch a lot of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

them, I've experienced it. So annually you have to send it in. And if you don't send it in, you don't get a new one. Now if you combine that, Jim's catch card with tags, and I can assure you that little plastic tags cost next to nothing, they cost pennies. And you -- with every permit you send 30 tags, 20 tags. Whatever number you come up with. And that recreational angler had better not only have a permit, he'd better have that fish in the boat with a tag in it. And if he doesn't he has hell to pay.

And if you don't put some teeth in it, no one will look at -- look at the telephone survey, I mean, with 5 percent or less reporting -- this is crazy and all we do is talk about this year after year after year. There are models in place in almost every state in the union. Look what North Carolina did with bluefin. Look what Maryland did. How come the federal government can't do it? What am I missing, and I really don't like this thing about the burden on the angular or the burden on the skipper.

I'm faxing cards everyday under penalties of death. You know, I shouldn't say that -- I'll get fined, shortly. Pretty soon I'll get a Nova in the mail saying, "Yeah, we remember that." But, you know, so I missed something here. It's like common

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

sense sort of, when we get into this area, just out of the window. Clue me in, why can't there be hell to pay, if you don't a tag, in your bluefin tuna. Is it hard to like fix it? Is it the pennies that it costs. We're spending how many hundreds or thousands of dollars for Quantec to falsely count the number they are getting, or maybe they are right, who knows. But we're spending hundreds of thousands or dollars on a god damn survey that doesn't work. How about if we take a 100 grand of that we spend it on tags and cards. What a great idea uh? And then if you get caught and also at the end of the year, you've got to send your tags in too with your card that's all filled out. You send in your clips of tags with the ones that you tagged missing, and the numbers better line up. Clue me in.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, well it's not just the pennies on the tags, but it's the other aspects of it that you've taken.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Quantec's money.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Bob
McAuliffe and Joe McBride and then we'll call it an
evening. All right, Bob McAuliffe and then Joe
McBride.

MR. McBRIDE: This is slight change in

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

subject. At the ICCAT meeting I challenged (inaudible) for a rum taste. He didn't show up with his rum. I've got several bottles of rum up stairs that I can't take home, would you like to do it now or tomorrow, because you can't do it the last day. Just show hands when you want to consume this.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: I think Joe McBride had some champagne for us, was that what you wanted to intervene Joe?

That's what I was going to MR. McBRIDE: Just in my arguments here, because listening to these analogies and criticisms of the industry and Russ to answer you, human nature being what it is and I think a number of commercial guys were good enough to castigate the recreational side. Enforcement is the whole ballgame. And if you don't enforce a regulation, don't make a regulation. don't care what it is, that's number 1. In New York State the local DEC boards, it inspects of federal regulation as well they do on the state regulation. But let me ask you this question in my ignorance. On a public resource, any fishery, it doesn't make any difference. I already know the answer, what does it cost? The cost that I gave you was \$27 for HMS, \$50 if you want to catch a dolphin or a Wahoo. So now

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

your getting close to a \$100, which there really should be one license, a federal license for everything, everybody recorded, but holding that to the side, what does it cost a dragger federally to go dragging in somewhere in the winger. What licenses, how much money? SPEAKER: Zero. MR. McBRIDE: They under your jurisdiction. SPEAKER: Well, the northeast multispecies

MR. McBRIDE: I am sorry?

Northeast multispecies permits SPEAKER: are issued without charge currently.

MR. McBRIDE: There's no charge, so if Joe McBride want to take his dragger out and go fishing it -- there's no choice. There is not a \$27 charge, there is not a \$50 charge?

SPEAKER: No.

MR. McBRIDE: Okay. If I were in that category I would be very happy, believe me.

SPEAKER: Bill Hogarth has initiated a national review of permitting systems with the intent of consolidating and making them uniform including a uniform fee standards so --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. McBRIDE: Yes.

SPEAKER: That will be --

MR. McBRIDE: My point I am being a little sarcastic I -- you know, we are willing to pay our way and I'm -- I'm not being facetious when I tell you don't make the law if you're not going to enforce the law. And that's the only valid criticism I see here to the recreational lack of support of whatever the regulations are, but on the other side of the coin we are paying are way and we should get something beneficial to our industry and I'm going to speak specifically to the sport fishing industry for the money we're paying up front, and I'm not criticizing the commercial for not paying, they are lot smarter than we are if they are not paying, if this is a fact what I'm hearing here from you ladies and gentleman here today. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All right, thank you all. It's ten after five, we're starting again at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning. So, please be prompt and we'll get through our agenda.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was adjourned for the evening).

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701